Manitoba Law
Reform Commission

IMPROVING THE SMALL CLAIMS SYSTEM IN MANITOBA

Final Report

February 2017

Manitoba Law
Reform Commission

432-405 Broadway, Winnipeg MB R3C 3L6
Phone 204-945-2896 • **Fax** 204-948-2184
E-mail mail@manitobalawreform.ca
Web www.manitobalawreform.ca

IMPROVING THE SMALL CLAIMS SYSTEM IN MANITOBA

Final Report #134

February 2017

Library and Archives Canada Cataloguing in Publication

Manitoba Law Reform Commission

Improving the Small Claims System in Manitoba

(Report ; 134)

Cover title.

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 978-0-7711-1582-0

The Commission's Reports are available electronically at www.manitobalawreform.ca.

The Manitoba Law Reform Commission was established by *The Law Reform Commission Act* in 1970 and began functioning in 1971.

Commissioners: Cameron Harvey, Q.C., President
Hon. Madam Justice Lori T. Spivak
Jacqueline Collins
Michelle Gallant
Sacha Paul
Myrna Philips

Director/Legal Counsel: Elizabeth McCandless

Administrator: Linda Manson

The Commission offices are located at 432–405 Broadway, Winnipeg, MB R3C 3L6.

Tel: (204) 945-2896 **Email:** mail@manitobalawreform.ca
Fax: (204) 948-2184 **Website:** http://manitobalawreform.ca

The Manitoba Law Reform Commission is funded through grants from:

THE MANITOBA LAW FOUNDATION

Manitoba

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Commission gratefully acknowledges the Honourable Gerry Jewers, former Commissioner and member of the Law Society of Manitoba's Access to Justice Stakeholders' Committee for proposing this project of law reform. The Commission would like to thank former staff member Jennifer Bird, legal counsel, for her research contributions to this project. The Commission wishes to express special thanks to Karen Fulham, Executive Director, Judicial Services, for her assistance and feedback on this project.

The Commission would also like to thank the following individuals for providing valuable feedback on this project: Keith Addison, Head, Recovery Legal Services, Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation; Gary Senft, Vice-President and Associate General Counsel, Public Policy and Regulatory Affairs, Great-West Life Assurance Company; Mary Troszko, Jennifer Dunik and Sean Young, Community Legal Education Association; the Creditors Rights and Insolvency Practice Group of D'Arcy & Deacon LLP, Karen Dyck, Former Executive Director, Legal Help Centre, Sandra Phillips, Manitoba Hydro, Law Division; and Paul J. Brett, Thompson Dorfman Sweatman LLP.

Please note that the information provided and recommendations made in this Report do not necessarily represent the views of those who have so generously assisted the Commission in this project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY vii

RÉSUMÉ ix

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION 1

CHAPTER 2: BACKGROUND 4

A. History of Small Claims in Manitoba 4
(a) Small Claims Under *The County Courts* 4
(b) Emergence of *The Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Act* 5
(c) Recent Amendments to the Act 8
B. Overview of Small Claims Procedure 10
(a) Who Can Adjudicate Small Claims? 10
(b) Limits on Monetary and Subject Matter Jurisdiction 11
(c) How to Make a Claim 13
(d) The Hearing Process 15
(e) The Appeal Process 17
(f) Enforcement of Judgments 19

CHAPTER 3: OTHER CANADIAN JURISDICTIONS 21

A. Monetary Limits in Other Canadian Jurisdictions 21
B. Small Claims Adjudicators in Other Canadian Jurisdictions 23
C. Pre-trial Processes in Other Canadian Jurisdictions 24
D. Provincial Small Claims Systems of Interest 24
(a) British Columbia 24
(b) Alberta 26
(c) Saskatchewan 27
(d) Ontario 28

CHAPTER 4: NEED FOR REFORM 30

A. The Consultation Process 30
B. Increasing the Monetary Jurisdiction 30
C. Increasing the General Damages Limit 33
D. Substantive Jurisdiction: Wrongful Dismissal Claims 34
E. Substantive Jurisdiction: Motor Vehicle Accident Liability Assessments 35
F. Pre-trial Process 36
G. Costs 38
(a) Whether to Increase the Costs Award 38

(b) "Successful Party" 39
H. Adjudication of Small Claims 40
I. Default Judgment 41
J. Other Issues 44

CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS 45

APPENDIX A 47

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Small Claims Court is a branch of the Court of Queen's Bench, designed to provide quick and inexpensive resolution for people claiming relatively small monetary awards for certain types of claims. The simplified procedure for small claims can be navigated without having to retain a lawyer, which makes the process more accessible for Manitobans compared to the ordinary procedure for claims initiated at the Court of Queen's Bench.

A simplified procedure for small claims was first enacted in Manitoba in 1972.[1] This procedure has evolved over time to the process in place today. *The Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Act*[2] ("*Small Claims Practices Act*") and the *Queen's Bench Rules*[3] establish the procedure for small claims in Manitoba. Small Claims Court has jurisdiction over all claims which do not exceed $10,000, which may include general damages up to $2,000.[4] This monetary limit has remained unchanged since 2007 and is one of the lowest in Canada.

In the Commission's view, reform is appropriate to improve and modernize the *Small Claims Practices Act* and to put it on par with other Canadian jurisdictions. This report will consider the need to update the *Small Claims Practices Act* by increasing the monetary jurisdiction; increasing the general damages limit; changes to the substantive jurisdiction of small claims; who should adjudicate small claims; and changes to the procedure for pre-trial processes, default judgment and costs. The Commission makes eleven recommendations that seek to strike a balance between ensuring that more people are able to access the simplified process under the *Small Claims Practices Act* with the concern that the small claims system does not become burdened with more complex issues that should be determined by a judge of the Court of Queen's Bench.

As part of this project, the Commission released a Consultation Report and online survey in October 2016.[5] The feedback from the consultation process was clear; respondents were overwhelmingly in favour of increasing the monetary jurisdiction of the *Small Claims Practices Act* and were supportive of proposed amendments to increase the efficiency of the administration of justice.

Reform of the *Small Claims Practices Act* can enhance access to justice in Manitoba in two ways. First, an increase in the monetary limit means that more people are able to have their disputes resolved in a more cost effective and expeditious forum as opposed to the more onerous

---

[1] *The County Court Act*, CCSM c C260 [repealed in 1984]. The initial legislation was Part II of *The County Courts Act*, SM 1971, c 77, and it applied only to the Winnipeg area. In 1972, the initial legislation was repealed and replaced a new Part II, which applied province-wide.
[2] CCSM c C285.
[3] *Queen's Bench Rules*, Man Reg 553/88, Rule 76.
[4] *Supra* note 2, s 3(1)(a).
[5] Manitoba Law Reform Commission, *Access to Courts and Court Processes: Improving the Small Claims System in Manitoba* (Consultation Report, October 2016), available online: http://manitobalawreform.ca/pubs/pdf/additional/consultation_report_oct2016.pdf.

procedure and stricter rules of evidence at the Court of Queen's Bench. Second, more claims being directed to Small Claims Court will help to relieve the burden on the Court of Queen's Bench and free up judicial resources.

This report forms part of a larger project entitled *Access to Courts and Court Processes*, which focuses on specific legislative amendments designed to promote the efficient administration of justice in Manitoba. In 2012, the Manitoba Law Reform Commission published an Issue Paper on Access to Justice,[6] which was intended to contribute to the ongoing discussion about access to justice. This project is considered the Commission's next step in addressing the ongoing access to justice problem in Manitoba.

[6] Manitoba Law Reform Commission, *Access to Justice* (Issue Paper #1, 2012), available online: http://manitobalawreform.ca/pubs/pdf/additional/issue_paper_access_justice.pdf.

RÉSUMÉ

Le Tribunal des petites créances est un ajout à la Cour du Banc de la Reine conçu afin de fournir une résolution rapide et peu coûteuse pour les personnes qui réclament des sommes relativement petites pour certains types de demandes. On peut passer à travers la procédure simplifiée pour les petites créances sans avoir à prendre un avocat, ce qui rend le processus plus accessible pour les Manitobains par rapport à la procédure ordinaire pour les créances commencées à la Cour du Banc de la Reine.

Une procédure simplifiée pour l'adjudication des petites créances a été adoptée au Manitoba en 1972.[7] Cette procédure a évolué au fil du temps jusqu'au processus qu'on a en place aujourd'hui. La Loi sur le recouvrement des petites créances à la Cour du Banc de la Reine (« Loi sur le recouvrement des petites créances ») et les Règles de la Cour du Banc de la Reine définissent la procédure pour les petites créances au Manitoba. Le Tribunal des petites créances a la compétence pour toutes les demandes ne dépassant pas 10 000 $, y compris les dommages-intérêts généraux n'excédant pas 2 000 $.[8] Cette limite monétaire est la même depuis 2007 et est l'une des plus basses au Canada.

Du point de vue de la Commission, une réforme est appropriée pour améliorer et moderniser la Loi sur le recouvrement des petites créances afin qu'elle soit à un niveau comparable aux lois d'autres provinces canadiennes. Le présent rapport étudiera la nécessité de mettre à jour la Loi sur le recouvrement des petites créances en augmentant la compétence en terme de limite monétaire, en augmentant la limite des dommages-intérêts généraux, en apportant des modifications pour améliorer la compétence des petites créances afin de supprimer les congédiements injustifiés de la compétence des petites créances, en définissant qui devrait statuer sur les petites créances, et en définissant les processus préalables au procès, les jugements par défaut et les dépens. La Commission fait onze recommandations qui cherchent à trouver un équilibre entre un nombre plus important de gens pouvant avoir accès au processus simplifié en vertu de la Loi sur le recouvrement des petites créances et les inquiétudes que le système des petites créances ne soit écrasé par des questions plus complexes qui devraient être décidées par un juge de la Cour du Banc de la Reine.

Dans le cadre de ce projet, la Commission a publié un rapport de consultation et un sondage en ligne en octobre 2016.[9] Les commentaires entendus pendant le processus de consultation étaient clairs : la très grande majorité des répondants étaient en faveur d'une augmentation de la

---

[7] *The County Courts Act*, c. C260 de la C.P.L.M. [abrogée en 1984]. La loi initiale était la partie II de la County Courts Act, c 77 de la L.M. 1971, et ne s'appliquait qu'à la région de Winnipeg. En 1972, la loi initiale a été abrogée et remplacée par une nouvelle partie II qui s'appliquait à toute la province.

[8] *Supra* note 2, alinéa 3(1)a).

[9] Commission de réforme du droit du Manitoba, *Accès aux tribunaux et processus judiciaires : améliorer le système des petites créances au Manitoba* (rapport de consultation, octobre 2016, en anglais seulement), consultable en ligne : http://manitobalawreform.ca/pubs/pdf/additional/consultation_report_oct2016.pdf.

compétence monétaire de la Loi sur le recouvrement des petites créances et appuyaient les modifications proposées pour améliorer l'efficacité de l'administration de la justice.

La réforme de la Loi sur le recouvrement des petites créances peut améliorer l'accès à la justice au Manitoba de deux manières. Tout d'abord, une augmentation de la limite monétaire signifie que plus de personnes peuvent voir leurs différends réglés dans un cadre plus rapide et plus avantageux au niveau du coût, contrairement aux étapes de procédure plus chères et aux règles sur la preuve plus strictes à la Cour du Banc de la Reine. Deuxièmement, le fait que plus de demandes sont envoyées au Tribunal des petites créances aidera à alléger le fardeau de la Cour du Banc de la Reine et libérera des ressources judiciaires.

Le présent rapport fait partie d'un projet plus important intitulé *Accès aux tribunaux et processus judiciaires*, qui se concentre sur des modifications législatives spécifiques élaborées pour promouvoir l'administration efficace de la justice au Manitoba. En 2012, la Commission de réforme du droit du Manitoba a publié un document thématique sur l'accès à la justice[10], qui avait pour objectif de contribuer à la discussion continue sur l'accès à la justice. Le présent projet est considéré comme étant l'étape suivante de la Commission pour répondre au problème continu d'accès à la justice au Manitoba.

[10]Commission de réforme du droit du Manitoba, *Accès à la justice* (document thématique n° 1, 2012, en anglais seulement), consultable en ligne : http://manitobalawreform.ca/pubs/pdf/additional/issue_paper_access_justice.pdf.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The monetary jurisdiction for small claims in Manitoba is one of the lowest in Canada. Should the monetary limit for small claims be increased? Should other changes be made to improve the small claims system in Manitoba?

The purpose of *The Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Act*[11] ("*Small Claims Practices Act*") is to determine claims in a simple manner as expeditious, informal and inexpensive as possible.[12] The benefits of having a process to deal with small claims are well established. A person can avoid a lengthy and expensive litigation process by going to Small Claims Court in situations where the person is claiming an amount not exceeding $10,000. The simplified process for small claims does not involve pre-trial procedures (such as the exchange of documents between parties, examinations for discovery, and pre-trial conferences) and the evidentiary rules are more relaxed as compared to the procedure and rules at the superior court level, which makes the process easier for individuals to represent themselves rather than having to retain a lawyer. It also helps to reduce the strain on the court system through the reduction of backlogs in higher courts. In 2015, 3793 claims were filed with the Small Claims Court as compared to 2527 claims filed at the Court of Queen's Bench.[13]

Much has been said about the growing access to justice problem in Canada. As noted by Supreme Court of Canada Chief Justice Beverley McLachlin in her introductory remarks on the Access to Justice in Civil and Family Matters 2013 Report, the justice system is failing in its responsibility to provide access to justice:

> Reports told us that cost, delays, long trials, complex procedures and other barriers were making it impossible for more and more Canadians to exercise their legal rights.[14]

In Manitoba, many important initiatives are underway to attempt to address access to justice issues, such as the Law Society of Manitoba's Family Law Access Centre,[15] Community Legal Education Association,[16] which provides legal information to members of the public; the

---

[11] CCSM c C285.
[12] *Ibid*, s 1(3).
[13] According to statistics provided by the Court Registry System in an e-mails dated 19 Sep 2016 and 5 Oct 2016.
[14] Canadian Forum on Civil Justice - Access Committee on Access to Justice in Civil and Family Matters. *Access to Civil and Family Justice: A Roadmap for Change* (October 2013) at i, available online: http://www.cfcj-fcjc.org/sites/default/files/docs/2013/AC_Report_English_Final.pdf.
[15] The Family Law Access Centre (FLAC) is a pilot project offered by the Law Society of Manitoba to assist middle-income families afford legal services with respect to family law matters. See the Law Society of Manitoba's website: http://www.lawsociety.mb.ca/for-the-public/family-law-access-centre.
[16] Community Legal Education Association (CLEA) is a charitable organization that provides legal information to Manitobans. See CLEA's website: http://www.communitylegal.mb.ca/about/mission-statement/.

establishment of the Legal Help Centre;[17] and an Access to Justice Stakeholders Committee to increase collaboration amongst the various organizations, to name just a few.

Having a robust small claims system in Manitoba improves access to justice in two important ways. First, it means that more claimants are able to have their disputes resolved in an expeditious way without having to retain a lawyer. Second, it frees up judicial resources at the Court of Queen's Bench to deal with more pressing matters such as criminal trials.

Recent decisions of the Supreme Court of Canada have highlighted the need to put access to justice rhetoric into action. In *R v. Jordan*,[18] the Court established a new framework for determining whether a person has been tried within a reasonable time as provided in section 11(b) of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*[19] and set a presumptive ceiling of 30 months between a criminal charge and the end of a trial at superior court. The Court held that an unjustified delay would result in a stay of the proceedings.[20] This change in the law makes the objective of freeing up judicial resources at the Court of Queen's Bench all the more pressing. In addressing the issue of judicial resources, the majority noted:

> We are aware that resource issues are rarely far below the surface of most s. 11(*b*) applications. By encouraging all justice system participants to be more proactive, some resource issues will naturally be resolved because parties will be encouraged to eliminate or avoid inefficient practices. At the same time, the new framework implicates the sufficiency of resources by reminding legislators and ministers that unreasonable delay in bringing accused persons to trial is not merely contrary to the public interest: it is constitutionally impermissible, and will be treated as such.[21]

In *Hryniak v. Mauldin*,[22] the Supreme Court of Canada addressed the need for more simplified procedures to promote access to civil justice. Justice Karakatsanis, writing for the Court held:

> Increasingly, there is recognition that a culture shift is required in order to create an environment promoting timely and affordable access to the civil justice system. This shift entails simplifying pre-trial procedures and moving the emphasis away from the conventional trial in favour of proportional procedures tailored to the needs of the particular

---

[17] The Legal Help Centre's mandate is mission is to "work in partnership with the community to increase access to legal and social service systems for disadvantaged community members by providing referrals, legal help and public legal education and information." See the Legal Help Centre's website: http://legalhelpcentre.ca/the-legal-help-centre.

[18] 2016 SCC 27 (CanLII), available online: http://www.canlii.org/en/ca/scc/doc/2016/2016scc27/2016scc27.html?autocompleteStr=R.%20v.%20Jordan&autocompletePos=2.

[19] *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, s 11(b), Part I of the *Constitution Act 1982* (UK), 1982, c 11.

[20] *R v Jordan*, *supra* note 18. See paras 159-212 for a summary of the framework.

[21] *Ibid* at para 117.

[22] [2014] 1 SCR 87, 2014 SCC 7 (CanLII), available online: http://www.canlii.org/en/ca/scc/doc/2014/2014scc7/2014scc7.html?autocompleteStr=Mauldin&autocompletePos=1.

> case. The balance between procedure and access struck by our justice system must come to reflect modern reality and recognize that new models of adjudication can be fair and just.[23]

This Consultation Report forms part of a larger Commission project entitled *Access to Courts and Court Processes*, which identifies specific legislative amendments that can be made to improve the efficient administration of justice in Manitoba. While the Commission recognizes that the changes proposed in this report only address one aspect of a large and multifaceted access to justice problem, the recommendations, if implemented, would improve access to courts and court processes by streamlining litigation where the monetary limit is relatively small, so that more claims could be made through the simplified procedure for small claims. Although there are many identified barriers to accessing the courts system, it is well established that the cost and complexity of litigation are two such barriers.[24]

Chapter 2 of this Consultation Report provides the history and background on small claims in Manitoba. Chapter 3 discusses small claims systems in other Canadian jurisdictions. Chapter 4 explores the need for reform and makes recommendations to improve the small claims system in Manitoba.

---

[23] *Ibid* at para 2.

[24] See *Hryniak v Mauldin, supra* note 22 at para 1. See also McGill, S, "Small Claims Court Identity Crisis: A Review of Recent Reform Measures," (2010) 49 Can. Bus. LJ 2 at 216, available online at: https://legacy.wlu.ca/documents/42428/2010_CBLJ_final_proofs.pdf

CHAPTER 2: BACKGROUND

Before considering whether reform to the small claims system is needed, it is necessary to review the nature of the current system. This chapter will review the history of small claims in Manitoba and describe how the current system for small claims works in practice.

A. History of Small Claims in Manitoba

In response to concerns about the complexity of civil litigation, as well as the expense it entails, many Canadian jurisdictions began to initiate a simplified, streamlined procedure for small claims in the 1970s and 1980s. This section will provide some background into the evolution of small claims in Manitoba from the first iteration in 1972 to the procedure for small claims in place today.

(a) Small Claims under *The County Courts Act*

Manitoba enacted its first province-wide, separate system for small claims in 1972, under Part II of *The County Courts Act*.[25] This simplified procedure for small claims has evolved over time to the process in place today.

When the small claims process was first enacted in Manitoba in 1972, the monetary limit was $1,000. In other words, $1,000 was the maximum amount of compensation an individual could claim for an action commenced under Part II of *The County Courts Act*, more commonly known as the small claims section of that Act. Under Part II of *The County Courts Act*, both County Court clerks and judges were empowered to hear such claims, but they were predominantly heard by clerks. A claimant could commence a small claims action by filing a simple statement of claim in a County Court office. The defendant could object to the proceeding under the less formal small claims procedure by filing a notice of objection with the County Court office, in which case, the defendant was required to file a statement of defence, and the matter would proceed to a trial before a judge. If no notice of objection was filed, then the defendant was presumed to have consented to having the matter heard as a small claims proceeding. The matter would then proceed to a trial before a clerk or a judge. If the claimant was successful the clerk or judge would file a certificate of decision, detailing the amount of the judgment and the costs and disbursements awarded. If the defendant chose not to appeal the decision, then the certificate of decision could be filed with the County Court office and upon filing, would become a judgment of that court and could be enforced in accordance with the County Court Rules.

---

[25] CCSM c C260 [repealed in 1984]. The initial legislation was Part II of *The County Courts Act*, SM 1971, c 77, and it applied only to the Winnipeg area. In 1972, the initial legislation was repealed and replaced a new Part II, which applied province-wide.

If the defendant chose to appeal the certificate of decision, the appellate procedure differed, depending upon whether or not a County Court clerk or judge heard the initial claim. If it was a clerk that had heard the initial claim, then the appeal would be heard by a County Court judge, and would be heard as a trial *de novo* (a completely new trial). If the initial claim had been heard by a County Court judge, then the matter could be appealed to the Manitoba Court of Appeal, and could only be appealed on a question of law alone.[26]

(b) Emergence of the Current Structure of *The Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Act*

In 1981, the Commission received a request from the then Attorney General to examine whether or not the Manitoba Court of Queen's Bench and the County Courts of Manitoba should be merged. It was also asked to study "means to ensure and improve the speedy, inexpensive and appropriate adjudication of small claims."[27] In its first report on this matter, entitled *Report on the Structure of the Courts; Part I: Amalgamation of the Court of Queen's Bench and the County Courts of Manitoba*[28] the Commission recommended amalgamation of these two courts, as well as the Surrogate Courts of Manitoba,[29] a recommendation which was adopted by the Legislative Assembly. Amalgamation of these courts into one court, the Manitoba Court of Queen's Bench, occurred in 1984[30] and *The Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Act* was enacted.[31]

As part of this project, the Commission published a second report entitled *Report on the Structure of the Courts; Part II: The Adjudication of Small Claims*, where the Commission made a number of recommendations with respect to changes to the system of small claims adjudication in place at that time, including:

- that small claims continue to be adjudicated by a court, rather than by an administrative tribunal, mediator or arbitrator;

- that small claims be heard by a separate division of an existing court, and that this court be the Provincial Court of Manitoba;

---

[26] The above information regarding small claims procedure under Part II of *The County Courts Act* has been taken from Manitoba Law Reform Commission, Report #55, *Report on the Structure of the Courts; Part II: The Adjudication of Smaller Claims* (Winnipeg: Queen's Printer, March 1983) [1983 Commission Report] at 7-8. This report is available online at: http://www.manitobalawreform.ca/pubs/pdf/archives/55-full_report.pdf.
[27] *Ibid* at 1.
[28] Manitoba Law Reform Commission, Report #52, *Report on the Structure of the Courts; Part I: Amalgamation of the Court of Queen's Bench and the County Courts of Manitoba* (Winnipeg: Queen's Printer, October 1982) [1982 Commission Report], available online at: http://www.manitobalawreform.ca/pubs/pdf/archives/52-full_report.pdf.
[29] *Ibid* at 36-38.
[30] An Act to Amend *The Queen's Bench Act* and to repeal *The County Courts Act*, *The Surrogate Courts Act* and *The County Court Judges' Criminal Courts Act* and to amend *The Municipal Boundaries Act*, SM 1982-83-84, c 82.
[31] SM 1982-83-84, c 83 (Assented to 18 August 1983).

- that all adjudicators of small claims be legally trained;

- that the monetary limit for small claims be increased from $1,000 to $3,000;

- that certain matters be excluded from the jurisdiction of the small claims court division, including matters in which the title to land is brought into question; matters in which the validity of any devise, bequest or limitation is disputed; matters involving the administration of estates or trusts; actions for malicious prosecution, false imprisonment or defamation; and actions filed against any judge, justice of the peace or peace officer for any act done in the course of performing his or her duties;

- that the small claims division have no jurisdiction to award an injunction or an order of specific performance;

- that costs awards for counsel be restricted to special circumstances;

- that a pilot program with respect to mediation for small claims be established, in order to determine whether province-wide mediation for small claims is feasible;

- that the rules with respect to admissibility of evidence in small claims court be relaxed;

- that that the information regarding small claims court and the forms for these types of actions be examined, and if necessary, redesigned so that the public can better understand how to bring and defend a small claims action; and

- that steps be taken to increase public awareness of the court, generally.[32]

Some of the Commission's recommended reforms were adopted by Manitoba's Legislative Assembly in the years following the 1983 report, including the recommended increase in the monetary limit for small claims from $1,000 to $3,000, restricting the subject matter jurisdiction of the court, relaxed rules of evidence, and limits with respect to costs awards.[33] Others, such as the pilot program with respect to mediation, were not implemented.

On January 1, 1989, a new provision was added to the *Small Claims Practices Act* specifying that general damages (non-specific damages that are difficult to quantify, such as pain and

---

[32] See 1983 Commission Report, *supra* note 26 at 50-54. Also see the Canadian Forum on Civil Justice's Inventory of Reforms: Small Claims Court and more specifically, the webpage entitled "Manitoba Small Claims Court;" http://www.cfcj-fcjc.org/inventory-of-reforms/manitoba-small-claims-court.

[33] *The Statute Law Amendment Act* (1985), SM 1985-86, c 51, s 10. See also Manitoba Law Reform Commission, Report #99, *Review of the Small Claims Court* (Winnipeg: Queen's Printer, March 1998) [1998 Commission Report] at 1. This report is available online at: http://www.manitobalawreform.ca/pubs/pdf/archives/99-full_report.pdf.

suffering, for example) in an amount not exceeding $1,000 may be awarded as compensation in respect of a small claim.[34] Subsequently, on September 1, 1989, the monetary limit with respect to small claims was increased from $3,000 to $5,000.[35]

In 1998, the Manitoba Law Reform Commission undertook a second review of the small claims system in Manitoba, this time, on its own initiative. In its report, entitled *Review of the Small Claims Court*,[36] the Commission noted that several task forces, in Manitoba and elsewhere, were examining the civil justice system in Canada, and whether changes were required to the system, including the system for adjudicating small claims. It stated:

> In light of all of these developments, the Commission decided that it was timely to revisit the small claims system in Manitoba with a view to determining whether further changes to the system were necessary or advisable, and whether some of the changes recommended in 1983 but not implemented, were still advisable.[37]

In its 1998 report, the Commission reiterated some of the recommendations it had initially made in its 1983 report, and made some additional recommendations. In particular, the Commission recommended:

- that small claims hearing officers should be lawyers licenced to practice in Manitoba with at least 5 five years of experience in practice;

- that, subject to Section 96 of the *Constitution Act, 1867*[38], hearing officers should be entitled to adjudicate more complex subject matter and order a wider array of remedies;

- that the monetary limit for small claims jurisdiction be increased from $5,000 to $7,500 and that the limit on claims for general damages be increased from $1,000 to $3,000;

- that the court's substantive jurisdiction be amended to allow the court to hear and determine interpleader applications[39] as long as the matters fall within the monetary

---

[34] See the Small Claims Court website: http://www.cfcj-fcjc.org/inventory-of-reforms/manitoba-small-claims-court.
[35] See *The Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Amendment Act*, SM 1988-89, c 10, s 4, available online at: http://web2.gov.mb.ca/laws/statutes/1988-89/c01088-89e.php.
[36] 1998 Commission Report #99, *supra* note 33.
[37] *Ibid* at 2.
[38] (UK), 30 & 31 Vict, c 3, available online at: http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/const/page-1.html. Section 96 of the *Constitution Act, 1867* empowers the Governor General to appoint superior, district and county court judges for each province. However, in this instance, by alluding to section 96, the Commission was referring to:

> . . .the constitutional prohibition on clothing provincially-created courts with "section 96" powers. That is, if small claims matters are adjudicated otherwise than by a judge of a superior, district or county court, the province is prohibited by section 93 of the *Constitution Act, 1867* from investing the Small Claims Court with powers that were historically exercised solely by those courts. [footnote omitted] (Review *of the Small Claims Court, supra* note 17 at 35.)

jurisdiction of the court;

- that a voluntary mediation program be instituted for the purposes of resolving small claims disputes;

- that steps be initiated to allow for better enforcement of small claims judgments, including establishing a new default judgment procedure requiring defendants to respond to claims and enabling claimants to obtain judgments against defendants that do not respond without having to appear in court, and allowing judgment creditors to have judgment debtors summonsed to court to answer questions regarding why they have not paid a claim; and

- that a process be introduced that would enable parties to introduce written evidence without having to call the author to testify in court.[40]

Since the Commission published its 1998 report, *Review of the Small Claims Court,* the monetary limit for small claims and the allowable amount for general damages have been increased twice. On July 14, 1999, the monetary jurisdiction was raised from $5,000 to $7,500, and general damages limit was raised from $1,000 to $1,500.[41] Subsequently, on February 12, 2007, the monetary jurisdiction was raised from $7,500 to $10,000, and general damages limit was raised from $1,500 to $2,000.[42]

(c) Recent Amendments to the Act

In 2014, the Legislature enacted *The Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Amendment Act,*[43] which introduced several changes to the *Small Claims Practices Act,* including new sections specifying who may hear claims;[44] provisions allowing judges or court officers, subject to the provisions of the Act, to hear and decide claims in the absence of the defendant;[45]

---

[39] Interpleader applications are applications made by persons who hold but do not own property, where the ownership or entitlement to that property is currently being disputed by two other parties. An interpleader application essentially forces the two disputing parties to litigate their dispute, so that the person who holds the property may obtain clarity with respect to whom the property in question actually belongs.

[40] 1998 Commission Report, *supra* note 33, at 51-52.

[41] See sections 1(2) to 1(4) of *The Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Amendment and Parental Responsibility Amendment Act,* SM 1999, c 22, available online at: http://web2.gov.mb.ca/laws/statutes/1999/c02299e.php#1.

[42] See sections 2 to 4 of *The Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Amendment Act,* SM 2006, c 36 (in force 12 February 2007 (Man.Gaz. 27 January 2007)), available online at: http://web2.gov.mb.ca/laws/statutes/2006/c03606e.php#.

[43] SM 2014, c 30, available online at: http://web2.gov.mb.ca/laws/statutes/2014/c03014e.php#.

[44] *Ibid*, ss 2.1(1) and (2).

[45] *Ibid*, ss 9-11.1(3).

and a new appeal process,[46] all of which will be described in the next section. Some of these changes were said to be a response to the problems caused by the appeal procedure under the *Small Claims Practices Act*, where the automatic right of appeal from a court officer's decision to a Court of Queen's Bench judge was purportedly being overused and was placing a burden on the Court of Queen's Bench.[47]

As noted by the then-Attorney General Andrew Swan at the second reading of Bill 64, *The Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Act*[48]:

> This bill will provide Manitobans with a more appropriate response to resolving monetary disputes that are under $10,000. It will continue to ensure a fair, efficient and effective way of achieving a just outcome at a reasonable cost and within a reasonable time. This approach is in keeping with the principles of access to justice, in particular, proportionality where steps taken to resolve a legal dispute should properly correspond to the complexity of the legal issues involved.[49]

On November 26, 2015, during the 5th Session of the 40th Legislature, former Justice Minister Gord Mackintosh introduced Bill 9, *The Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Amendment Act*,[50] in the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba. Had this bill been enacted, it would have amended Section 3(1)(a) and various other sections of the *Small Claims Practices Act* to remove any mention of a $10,000 monetary limit with respect to small claims, replacing "an amount of money not exceeding $10,000" in Section 3(1)(a) of the Act, and similar phrases or references to $10,000 in various other sections of the Act, with the words "claim limit."[51] Bill 9 would also have added a definition of "claim limit" to the section 1(1) of the Act. Pursuant to clause 2 of the bill, "claim limit" would have been defined as "$10,000 or any greater amount prescribed by regulation." In other words, Bill 9, if enacted, would have allowed for changes to the monetary limit to small claims to be made by regulation, as long as the limit was set at some amount greater than the current $10,000 limit.[52] The bill would also have allowed for the current $2,000 limit for general damages found at Section 3(1)(a) of the *Small Claims Practices Act* to likewise be amended upward by regulation.

Bill 9 was never enacted. It died on the *Order Paper* on March 16, 2016 when the 40th Legislature was dissolved in anticipation of Manitoba's 41st General Election.

---

[46] *Ibid*, ss 12(1)-15(3).
[47] Manitoba, Legislative Assembly, *Hansard*, 40th Leg, 3rd Sess, (26 May 2014) at 2893-2894 (Hon Andrew Swan).
[48] Bill 64, *The Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Amendment Act*, 3rd Sess, 40th Leg, Manitoba, 2014 (assented to 10 December 2014), available online: http://web2.gov.mb.ca/bills/40-3/b064e.php.
[49] *Supra* note 47 at 2894.
[50] Bill 9, *The Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Amendment Act*, 5th Sess, 40th Leg, Manitoba, 2015, available online at: http://web2.gov.mb.ca/bills/40-5/b009e.php.
[51] *Ibid* at clauses 3(1), 4 and 5.
[52] *Ibid.* at clauses 2 and 7.

B. Overview of Small Claims Procedure in Manitoba

Small claims procedure in Manitoba is currently governed by the *Small Claims Practices Act* and Rule 76 of the *Court of Queen's Bench Rules*.[53] This section will provide an overview of the current procedure governing the adjudication of small claims in Manitoba.

(a) Who Can Adjudicate Small Claims?

Pursuant to the *Small Claims Practices Act*, only judges and court officers have authority to adjudicate small claims.[54] In practice, most small claims are heard by court officers. "Court officer" is defined as "the registrar, a deputy registrar or an assistant deputy registrar of the court."[55] As is stated on the Manitoba Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims information website, "Small Claims, for the most part, are heard by Court Officers who may or may not be legally trained but have experience and training in the court system" although "[s]ome Small Claims may be heard by judges of the Court of Queen's Bench."[56] Currently there are five court officers that hear small claims in fifteen locations throughout Manitoba.[57]

As mentioned above, in 2014, the Manitoba Legislature amended the *Small Claims Practices Act* to ensure that most claims continue to be heard by court officers. Section 2.1(1) of the Act now states:

> 2.1(1) Subject to subsection (2), a claim under this Act **must** be heard and decided by a court officer. [emphasis added]

Section 2.1(2) then goes on to state:

> A claim under this Act must be heard and decided by a judge if
>
> (a) not yet proclaimed;
>
> (b) a person or entity specified in the regulations is a party to the claim; or
>
> (c) a court officer directs that, in the interest of the administration of justice, the claim be heard and decided by a judge.

---

[53] *Court of Queen's Bench Rules*, Man Reg 553/88.
[54] *Small Claims Practices Act, supra* note 11, s 2.
[55] *Ibid*, s 1(1).
[56] See the Manitoba Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Information website: http://www.manitobacourts.mb.ca/court-of-queens-bench/court-proceedings/small-claim-information-claims-filed-after-january-1-2015.
[57] Manitoba, *Annual Report of Manitoba Justice and the Justice Initiatives Fund 2014-2015* at 45, available online: http://www.gov.mb.ca/justice/publications/annualreports/pubs/annualreport1415.pdf.

With respect to section 2.1(2)(b) of the Act, the only person or entity specified in the regulations is the government.[58] Accordingly, a claimant will only have his or her small claim heard by a judge if a court officer so directs, in the interest of the administration of justice, or if the Government of Manitoba[59] is a party to the claim. The reason why claims involving the Government of Manitoba must be heard by judges, as opposed to court officers, relates to the degree of independence of court officers. As explained by the then-Attorney General Andrew Swan in legislative debates, court officers "...don't have the same guarantee of independence. So as to ensure no concerns as to their independence, any small claim cases which involve the provincial government, agency or Crown corporation would then go to the Queen's Bench."[60]

(b) Limits on Monetary and Subject Matter Jurisdiction

i. Monetary Jurisdiction

As stated previously, pursuant to section 3(1)(a) of the *Small Claims Practices Act*, a claim made under the Act must be for an amount of money not exceeding $10,000, which may include general damages in an amount not exceeding $2,000. In other words, the claimant must be seeking monetary compensation, and not some other type of remedy or relief, and the amount of compensation being sought must not exceed $10,000 in total. This monetary limit can include up to $2,000 in compensation for injury or harm that is not easily quantifiable. Accordingly, if a claimant wants the advantage of the relaxed rules of evidence and the simplified court processes available under the *Small Claims Practices Act* and the amount of the claim is more than $10,000, the claimant may abandon the portion of his claim that is greater than $10,000 so that it may be dealt with under the Act.

The $10,000 limit to the claim does not include a claim for pre-judgment interest.[61] In other words, if a claimant is successful, the claimant could be awarded pre-judgment interest over and above the $10,000 monetary limit.

---

[58] See *The Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Regulation*, Man Reg 283/2015, s 1, which came into force on 01 January 2015. This regulation is available online at: http://web2.gov.mb.ca/laws/regs/current/_pdf-regs.php?reg=283/2014.

[59] There is no definition of "government" in either the *Small Claims Practices Act* or in *The Court of Queen's Bench Act*, CCSM c C280, available online at: http://web2.gov.mb.ca/laws/statutes/ccsm/c280e.php (pursuant to section 1(2) of the *Small Claims Practices Act*, "words and expressions used in this Act have the same meaning as they have in *The Court of Queen's Bench Act*." However, the definitions contained in the Schedule to the *Interpretation Act*, CCSM c I80 (available online at: http://web2.gov.mb.ca/laws/statutes/ccsm/i080e.php) apply to every Act and regulation in Manitoba. The Schedule to the *Interpretation Act* defines "government" as "Her Majesty the Queen acting for the Province of Manitoba."

[60] Manitoba, Legislative Assembly, *Hansard*, 40th Leg, 3rd Sess, (26 May 2014), *supra* note 47 at 2894 (Hon Andrew Swan).

[61] *Small Claims Practices Act*, *supra* note 11, s 3(3). Pre-judgment interest refers to the interest accruing on the amount of an award from the time the damage occurred to the time the judgment is entered by the court.

If claims are above the $10,000 monetary limit, they fall outside the jurisdiction of the *Small Claims Practices Act*.

Note that the *Court of Queen's Bench Rules* also provides for a streamlined process for claims that do not exceed $100,000, exclusive of interest and costs.[62] This procedure, known as Rule 20A or the Expedited Actions Rule, is designed to be more efficient than a regular proceeding at the Court of Queen's Bench. It begins with a mandatory case conference to explore settlement possibilities and streamline proceedings.[63]

ii. Subject Matter Jurisdiction

In terms of the type of subject matter which may form the basis for the monetary relief sought under the Act, rather than specifying the types of matters which may form the basis for a claim, the Act provides a list of types of claims which may not be decided under the Act, regardless of whether or not the claimant is only seeking monetary compensation. The following types of claims may not be dealt with under the Act:

- disputes between a landlord and tenant over a residential tenancy;[64]
- disputes over real property or interests in real property;[65]
- disputes over inheritance under a will[66] or over the administration of a trust or an estate;[67]
- disputes over family law matters that would come within the jurisdiction of the Family Division of the Court of Queen's Bench, including matters involving family status, child custody and access, division of property upon relationship breakdown, and child or spousal support;[68]
- allegations of malicious prosecution, false imprisonment or defamation;[69] or
- allegations of wrongdoing by a judge or a justice.[70]

---

[62] *The Court of Queen's Bench Rules*, *supra* note 53, Rule 20A(2). Note that family and class proceedings are excluded from Rule 20A proceedings.
[63] *Ibid*, Rule 20A(9).
[64] *Small Claims Practices Act*, *supra* note 11, s 3(2).
[65] *Ibid*, s 3(4)(a).
[66] *Ibid*, s 3(4)(b).
[67] *Ibid*, s 3(4)(c).
[68] *Ibid*, s 3(4)(d).
[69] *Ibid*, s 3(4)(e).
[70] *Ibid*, s 3(4)(f).

Most of the above restrictions as to subject matter have been put in place because of the complexity of the subject matter involved in the disputes and the interests at stake. Many of the types of disputes described above do not lend themselves easily to the relaxed rules of evidence, lack of interlocutory proceedings,[71] and informal processes available for small claims matters. In addition, many of these types of disputes are likely to involve claims exceeding $10,000 in value. Finally, in order to adjudicate many of the above disputes, it would be necessary for the adjudicator in question to have either specialized legal knowledge or formal legal training, which court officers, who are responsible for adjudicating most disputes under the Act, may not have.

The jurisdiction of the *Small Claims Practices Act* also extends to some types of motor vehicle accident claims. Section 3(1)(b) states that a person may file a claim under the *Small Claims Practices Act* to obtain "an assessment of liability arising from a motor vehicle accident in which the vehicle of the claimant is not damaged. These assessments are purely for the determination of liability. If damage has been sustained to the claimant's vehicle, in addition to the liability assessment under section 3(1)(b), the claimant can also advance a claim for the deductible portion of damages.

(c) How to Make a Claim

A person begins a claim by filing a claim form with one of the various court centres throughout Manitoba (generally, the one that is closest to where the defendant lives or alternatively, to where the dispute arose).[72] The claimant must set out the particulars of the claim in the form prescribed by Rule 76 of *The Court of Queen's Bench Rules* and sign the claim form.[73] The claimant must also pay a filing fee of $50, if the amount of the claim is less than $5,000, or $75, if the amount of the claim is between $5,000 and $10,000.[74] Upon receipt of the filed claim and payment of the requisite fee, the court officer is required to set a hearing date for the claim.[75] Prior to January 1, 2015, the court officer was required to schedule the hearing date within 60 days of the date that the claim was filed. However, this requirement was eliminated when the

---

[71] Interlocutory proceedings are legal proceedings that occur between the commencement and the end of a lawsuit. These types of proceedings are designed to have temporary or provisional, rather than permanent effect, and are generally initiated by parties to, for example, preserve property or seize or freeze assets, so that they are not sold between the time that a claim has been made and the time that a judgment has been rendered on a claim or counterclaim which would frustrate the ability for the successful party to collect on his or her claim.

[72] *Small Claims Practices Act, supra* note 11, s 6(1) and the Manitoba Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Information website: http://www.manitobacourts.mb.ca/court-of-queens-bench/court-proceedings/small-claim-information/ and http://www.manitobacourts.mb.ca/court-of-queens-bench/court-proceedings/small-claim-information-claims-filed-after-january-1-2015/.

[73] Section 6(1) of the *Small Claims Practices Act, supra* note 11 and Rule 76.03(1)(a) of *The Court of Queen's Bench Rules, supra* note 53.

[74] See the Manitoba Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Information website: http://www.manitobacourts.mb.ca/court-of-queens-bench/court-proceedings/small-claim-information-claims-filed-after-january-1-2015.

[75] *Small Claims Practices Act, supra* note 11, s 8(1).

2014 *Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Amendment Act*[76] came into force, and section 8(2) of the Act, which had contained this 60 day time limit, was repealed.[77]

Once the claim has been filed in one of Manitoba's court centres and a court officer has set the date, time and location for the hearing, the claimant has 30 days to serve the defendant(s) with a copy of the claim, unless the court officer, upon motion by the claimant, grants the claimant an extension of time.[78] The claimant must also serve the defendant with a Notice of Appearance.[79] The defendant is not required to file a Notice of Appearance with the court registry, but may do so in response to the claim in order to signal his or her intention to appear in court, either to dispute the claim (in which case, the defendant is required to provide his or her reasons for doing so) or to request time to pay the amount claimed.[80] The Notice of Appearance must be filed with the appropriate court registry no later than seven days before the scheduled hearing date.[81] Having said this, however, Rule 76.05(2) states that notwithstanding a defendant's failure to file a Notice of Appearance, if the defendant shows up at the hearing, he or she is entitled to be heard.

The defendant may also make a counterclaim against the claimant by filing it at the appropriate court centre and serving it on the claimant.[82] If the counterclaim is for an amount not exceeding $10,000 and the counterclaim is not joined with a counterclaim for a remedy other than money, or alternatively, if the defendant chooses to abandon that portion of the counterclaim which exceeds $10,000, then the counterclaim may be dealt with under the *Small Claims Practices Act*.[83] If the defendant is counterclaiming for an amount over $10,000, or is including a claim for a remedy other than monetary compensation in a counterclaim, then the court officer will adjourn the small claims matter for 30 days in order to give the defendant an opportunity to commence a civil action in the Court of Queen's Bench under *The Court of Queen's Bench Act*[84] and the regular rules of civil procedure contained in the *Court of Queen's Bench Rules* apply, rather than under the *Small Claims Practices Act* and Rule 76 of *The Court of Queen's Bench Rules*.[85] The defendant must provide the court officer with proof that the defendant has commenced an action, via statement of claim, under *The Court of Queen's Bench Act* within 5

---

[76] *Supra* note 43.
[77] See section 8(2) of the *Small Claims Practices Act* as it read prior to 01 January 2015, available online at: http://web2.gov.mb.ca/laws/statutes/archive/c285(2014-12-31)e.php?df=2012-06-14.
[78] *Small Claims Practices Act, supra* note 11, ss 6(2.1) and 6(3).
[79] Service of documents is dealt with under sections 21(1) to 21(5) of the *Small Claims Practices Act, supra* note 11, and by Rules 76.03(3), 76.04 and 76.06 of *The Court of Queen's Bench Rules, supra* note 53. The relevant sections of the Act set out the manner and procedure for service, while the rules dictate the forms to be used.
[80] *The Court of Queen's Bench Rules, ibid*, Rule 76.03(1)(b) and Form 76 D.
[81] *Ibid*, Rule 76.05(1).
[82] *Ibid*, Rule 76.06.
[83] *Small Claims Practices Act, supra* note 11, ss 4 and 5(1).
[84] CCSM c C280.
[85] See section 5(1) of the *Small Claims Practices Act, supra* note 11.

days of the date scheduled for the hearing of the small claim. Once this has been done, the small claims matter will be deemed to be discontinued.[86]

In general, there are no interlocutory proceedings allowed in a small claims matter.[87]

Sometimes, small claims matters will settle prior to the matter being heard or adjudicated by a court officer or a judge. In such cases, if the defendant consents to judgment, the claimant is entitled to costs and disbursements.[88] If, conversely, the claimant withdraws the claim before the hearing then the defendant is entitled to disbursements he or she has reasonably incurred in respect of the claim.[89]

(d) The Hearing Process

The purpose behind developing a separate process for small claims was, as stated previously, to "provide for the determination of claims in a simple manner as expeditious, informal and inexpensive as possible."[90] To that effect, the hearing process is designed to be quicker and simpler than the ordinary litigation process under the *Court of Queen's Bench Rules*. For instance, the *Small Claims Practices Act* states that a claim may be dealt with in a summary manner and that the *Court of Queen's Bench Rules*, other than Rule 76 (the small claims rule), do not apply. Further, the Court Officer may conduct the hearing as he or she considers appropriate in order to effect an expeditious and inexpensive determination of the claim.[91] Claimants and defendants are not required to be represented by a lawyer, articling student or a student-at-law, but they may be represented by such counsel if they so choose.[92]

Subject to the limited exceptions noted above, hearings are presided over by court officers.[93] If both the claimant and defendant appear at the hearing, then both parties may introduce evidence, including evidence provided by witnesses,[94] and the court officer may admit as evidence anything that they consider relevant, regardless of whether or not it would be admissible under the laws of evidence, with the exception of evidence that is subject to solicitor-client privilege or

---

[86] *Ibid*, s 5(2).
[87] See section 8.3 of the *Small Claims Practices Act, supra* note 11.
[88] *Ibid*, ss 19(3) and 14(1). Costs, when awarded, are generally designed to compensate the successful party to an action for legal fees incurred in pursuing or defending against a claim. Disbursements are the expenses that one incurs while pursing or defending a claim, such as mailing costs, expert reports, photocopying costs, and so on. In small claims matters, pursuant to section 14(1) of the Act, a costs award may not exceed $100, except in exceptional circumstances. If a defendant makes a counterclaim and the claimant consents to judgment, then the defendant is entitled to costs (not exceeding $100, except for exceptional circumstances) and disbursements with respect to his or her counterclaim. See sections 19(2) and 14(1) of the Act.
[89] *Ibid*, s 19(1).
[90] *Ibid*, s 1(3).
[91] *Ibid*, s 1(4).
[92] *Ibid*, s 8.1.
[93] *Ibid*, ss 2.1(1) and (2).
[94] *Ibid*, ss 8.4(1) and 8.5.

any other type of privilege recognized under the laws of evidence.[95] Evidence must be recorded, but if for some reason, a recording is not possible, the court officer is required to prepare a summary of evidence and, upon request, provide it on all parties to the claim.[96]

After hearing the evidence, and submissions, the court officer decides the claim, including any counterclaim or set-off.[97] The court officer must issue a certificate of decision, containing a summary of reasons for the decision, and provide it to each of the parties.[98] Once a certificate of decision has been issued, it is considered a Court of Queen's Bench judgment and may be enforced as such.[99]

As part of the 2014 amendments, if the defendant does not appear at the hearing, then the court officer must allow the claimant to prove service of the claim, hear and decide the claim in the defendant's absence and dismiss the defendant's counterclaim.[100] This may result in a default judgment being made against the defendant.

The Act provides defendants an opportunity to have default judgments set aside. The defendant may file an application to have such a default judgment set aside, by filing an application in the appropriate form in the court centre where the claim was filed.[101] The defendant must also pay $150 as security for costs.[102] The court officer will then set a date for the court to hear the application to set aside the original decision (default judgment in favour of the claimant).[103] The defendant must then serve a copy of the application of the claimant and any other parties within 20 days of the date of filing his application to set aside the original decision.[104] If the original decision was made by a judge, then the application to set aside the decision must also be heard by a judge. If the original decision was made by a court officer, then the application to set aside the decision must be heard by a court officer.[105] At the hearing, the defendant must satisfy the judge or court officer that he or she did not wilfully or deliberately fail to appear at the original hearing, that the defendant applied to set aside the original decision as soon as reasonably possible, or alternatively, if there was a delay in doing so, is able to give a reasonable explanation for delay, and that it is fair and just in the circumstances for the decision to be set aside.[106] If the judge or court officer is satisfied on all of these counts, then the matter will be scheduled for a new hearing on the merits, and the original default judgment in favour of the

---

[95] *Ibid,* ss 8.4(1) and 8.4(2).
[96] *Ibid,* ss 8.8(1) and 8.8(2).
[97] *Ibid,* s 9(1).
[98] *Ibid,* s 9(3).
[99] *Ibid,* s 9(4).
[100] *Ibid,* s 9(2).
[101] *Ibid,* ss 11(1) and 11(2) *and* Rule 76.12(1) of *The Court of Queen's Bench Rules, supra* note 53.
[102] See Rule 76.12(2) of *The Court of Queen's Bench Rules, ibid.*
[103] See s 11(3) of the *Small Claims Practices Act, supra* note 11.
[104] *Ibid,* s 11(4) and Rule 76.12(3) of *The Court of Queen's Bench Rules, supra* note 53.
[105] See s 11(5) of the *Small Claims Practices Act, supra* note 11.
[106] *Ibid,* s 11(6).

claimant will be set aside.[107] If the judge or court officer is not satisfied of this, then the original decision stands, and the original decision may be enforced as a judgment of the court.[108] In either case, the judge or court officer must provide reasons.[109] The decision of a judge or court officer on the matter of whether or not to let the default judgment stand or alternatively, to schedule a new hearing, is final and is not appealable.[110]

If the claimant does not appear at the hearing, then the judge or court officer may dismiss the claim, without hearing any evidence or adjourn the hearing to a specified date, imposing such terms and conditions as the judge or court officer feels are appropriate.[111] If the defendant has made a counterclaim then the judge or court officer may decide the counterclaim in the claimant's absence and render a default judgment against the claimant.[112] In such a case the claimant may apply to have the default judgment in respect of the counterclaim set aside in the same manner as a defendant might do with respect to a default judgment rendered on a claim.[113]

(e) The Appeal Process

Different rules for appeals apply, depending upon whether or not the small claim in question was filed prior to January 1, 2015, the date that the 2014 *Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Amendment Act*[114] came into force. This section will describe both sets of rules; however, it appears that appeals made under the old procedure are decreasing so that the old procedure will no longer be applicable.

(i) Small Claims Filed Prior to January 1, 2015

If a claimant or defendant wishes to appeal a court officer's decision in respect of a small claim, and that claim was filed prior to January 1, 2015, the claimant does not require leave of a judge of the Manitoba Court of Queen's Bench to appeal, unless the person wishing to file the appeal did not appear at the original hearing, in which case leave to appeal from a Court of Queen's Bench judge is required.[115] The Notice of Appeal must be filed within 30 days of the date the original decision was rendered by the court officer on the small claim.[116] Any attempts to enforce the original judgment are stayed until the decision is rendered on the appeal.[117]

---

[107] *Ibid*, ss 11(7) and 11(8).
[108] *Ibid*, s 11(9).
[109] See Rule 76.13(2) of *The Court of Queen's Bench Rules*, *supra* note 53.
[110] See s 11(10) of the *Small Claims Practices Act*, *supra* note 11.
[111] *Ibid*, s 20(1).
[112] *Ibid*, s 20(2).
[113] *Ibid*, s 20(3).
[114] *Supra* note 37.
[115] See ss 12(2) and 12(3) of the *Small Claims Practices Act* as it read prior to 01 January 2015, *supra* note 42.
[116] See s 12(4) of the *Small Claims Practices Act* as it read prior to 01 January 2015, *supra* note 42.
[117] *Ibid*, s 12(6).

Under this procedure, a judge of the Manitoba Court of Queen's Bench hears and renders a decision on the appeal. The appeal, in these circumstances, is conducted as a new trial.[118] The appeal is to be dealt with in a summary manner, and the *Court of Queen's Bench Rules* do not apply unless the judge so orders at the request of one of the parties. The judge's decision on this appeal is generally considered final, and may be enforced as a judgment of the Court of Queen's Bench. Although a further appeal to the Manitoba Court of Appeal is possible, such an appeal may only take place with leave of that court, and on a question of law alone.[119] The Court of Queen's Bench judge hearing the appeal may order costs to the successful party in such an amount as the judge may allow.[120]

The limitation period for most claims filed prior to January 1, 2015 has already expired. According to statistics provided by the Court of Queen's Bench Registry, it appears that the number of claimants filing Notice of Appeals has gone down considerably as a result of the changes brought in by the 2014 amendments to the *Small Claims Practices Act*. For example, in 2014, prior to the amendments, 176 Notices of Appeal were filed; in 2015, 64 Notices of Appeal were filed; and in 2016, between January 1 and August 31, only 11 Notices of Appeal were filed.[121] This shows that the old process for appeals is gradually being replaced by the new process, and soon will no longer be applicable.

(ii) Small Claims Filed After January 1, 2015

With respect to claims that have been filed with the court after January 1, 2015, regardless of whether or not the original decision on the claim was rendered by a court officer or a judge, leave is required before the appeal will be heard, and an appeal may only be made on a question of law or jurisdiction.[122]

In situations where the original decision was made by a court officer, both the request for leave to appeal and the appeal itself will be heard by judges of the Court of Queen's Bench.[123] The appellant must file an application for leave to appeal and notice of appeal at the court centre where the claim was originally filed within 30 days of the Certificate of Decision being issued by the court officer. Once the application for leave to appeal and Notice of Appeal have been filed, the appellant has 20 days to serve these documents on the respondent or on any other parties to the claim.[124] Until such time a decision has been made to dismiss the application for leave to

---

[118] *Ibid*, s 12(5).
[119] *Ibid*, s 13(b) and s 15.
[120] *Ibid*, s 14(2).
[121] Based on statistics compiled by the Court Registry System Statistics, provided to the Commission via e-mail on 19 September 2016.
[122] See ss 12(1) and 15(1) of the current *Small Claims Practices Act*, *supra* note 11.
[123] *Ibid*, ss 12(1) and 12(8).
[124] *Ibid*, s 12(5).

appeal, or, if the application for leave is granted, until the judge who decides the appeal makes a further order, enforcement of the original judgment of the court officer is stayed.[125]

A Court of Queen's Bench judge will first set down a hearing of the application for leave to appeal. At that time, the appellant will need to convince the judge that an error of law or jurisdiction was made at first instance by the court officer. If the appellant is successful in this regard, the judge will set the matter down for appeal.[126]

The judge who hears the appeal is responsible for determining the appeal process. The judge can determine whether the appeal is to be heard by oral argument or by a new hearing of the evidence; what written materials must be filed; and whether to order some or all of the transcript of the original hearing be provided to the court.[127] After hearing the appeal, the judge may confirm the original decision made by the court officer, or allow the appeal, set aside the court officer's decision and make any ruling the court officer might have made.[128] The judge must also, in his or her decision, give directions with respect to the stay of proceedings to enforce the original judgment.[129] The judge will issue a Certificate of Decision, and provide it to all parties to the appeal.[130] The Certificate of Decision is considered a judgment of the Court of Queen's Bench and may be enforced as such.[131] The Court of Queen's Bench judge may also order costs to the successful party in such amounts as the judge may allow.[132] There is no appeal available to the Manitoba Court of Appeal.[133]

In situations where the original decision was made by a judge, a party may appeal the decision to the Manitoba Court of Appeal, with leave, on a question of law or jurisdiction. If leave to appeal is granted, the Court of Appeal may confirm or set aside the judge's decision and make any order that the judge of the Court of Queen's Bench could have made.[134]

---

[125] *Ibid*, ss 12(6) and 12(7).
[126] *Ibid*.
[127] *Ibid*, ss 12(8) and 12(9).
[128] *Ibid*, s 12(10).
[129] *Ibid*.
[130] *Ibid*, s 12(11).
[131] *Ibid*, s 12(12).
[132] *Ibid*, s 14(2).
[133] *Ibid*, s 13. With respect to claims filed with the court after January 1, 2015 that were heard and decided by a Court of Queen's Bench judge, rather than a court officer, an appeal is potentially available to the Manitoba Court of Appeal. As with an appeal of a decision of a court officer, in circumstances where the original claim was filed after January 1, 2015, leave to appeal is required and an appeal may only be made with respect to a question of law or jurisdiction. If leave to appeal is granted, the Court of Appeal may confirm the original decision of the Court of Queen's Bench judge or substitute his or her decision for that of the Court of Appeal and make any order that the Court of Queen's Bench judge could have made. See the *Small Claims Practices Act, supra* note 11, ss 15(1)-(3). Also see Rules 3, 3.1, 4, 9 and 10 of the *Court of Appeal Rules*, Man Reg 555/88 R, available online at: http://www.canlii.org/en/mb/laws/regu/man-reg-555-88-r/latest/man-reg-555-88-r.html.
[134] *Small Claims Practices Act, supra* note 11, ss 15(1)-(3).

The Manitoba Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Checklist for Appeals for small claims filed after January 1, 2015 stresses the challenges entailed in demonstrating that a court officer or judge has made an error on a question of law or of jurisdiction. The checklist strongly suggests that the appellant consult a lawyer and seek legal advice on these points.[135]

(f) Enforcement of Judgments

Decisions made by either a court officer or Court of Queen's Bench judge adjudicating a small claim at first instance, or decisions made by a Court of Queen's Bench judge on an appeal from a decision made by a court officer, may be enforced as judgments of the Court of Queen's Bench.[136] This means that all of the enforcement mechanisms available to successful parties to enforce judgments in any other action pursued in the Court of Queen's Bench are also available to successful parties in small claims matters. As small claims are claims for monetary compensation, the most common mechanisms used by successful parties to enforce their judgments appear to be garnishment, writs of seizure and sale and registration of judgments as liens against real property owned by unsuccessful parties.[137]

As noted by the Commission in its 1998 *Review of the Small Claims Court* report:

> Ultimately, however, it is up to the judgment creditor, and not the court, to enforce the judgment. Many individual claimants fail to realize this fact before filing their claim, and are subsequently disappointed.[138]

Note that, unless otherwise specified in Rule 76, the other *Court of Queen's Bench Rules* do not apply to proceedings under the Act.[139]

---

[135] *Supra* note 34.

[136] See ss 9(4) and 12(12) of the *Small Claims Practices Act*, *supra* note 11.

[137] See Rule 60.02(1) of the *Court of Queen's Bench Rules*, *supra* note 53 and s 2 of *The Judgments Act*, CCSM, c J10, available online at: http://web2.gov.mb.ca/laws/statutes/ccsm/j010e.php. Also see the *Manitoba Small Claims Court Checklist – Collecting on Your Judgment*, available online at: http://www.manitobacourts.mb.ca/site/assets/files/1672/collecting_on_your_judgment_-_e_2015_clean-6.pdf.

[138] 1998 Commission Report, *supra* note 32 at 11.

[139] See s 1(4) of the *Small Claims Practices Act*, *supra* note 11 and Rule 76.07(1) of the *Court of Queen's Bench Rules*, *supra* note 53, the latter of which incorporates Rule 53.04 of the Rules (the rule which governs the summonsing of witnesses) into Rule 76.

CHAPTER 3: OTHER CANADIAN JURISDICTIONS

In considering reform to Manitoba's small claims system, it is helpful to review the small claims systems in other Canadian jurisdictions.

The details of small claims procedure varies somewhat from jurisdiction to jurisdiction, as does the monetary limit for small claims. However, in enacting a procedure for the adjudication of small claims, all jurisdictions appear to be motivated by the goal of allowing certain types of claims, where the amount being claimed by the person making the claim is below a certain monetary threshold, to be heard in a less formal and more expeditious manner, such that neither the claimant nor the defendant would require a lawyer, and would be capable of representing him or herself in court.

A. Monetary Limits in Other Canadian Jurisdictions

As the chart below will demonstrate, Manitoba's $10,000 monetary limit is one of the lowest monetary limits for small claims in Canada. In fact, only Prince Edward Island's small claims monetary limit is lower than Manitoba's.

Jurisdiction	Monetary Limit	Date Current Monetary Limit Instituted
Alberta	$50,000	01 August 2014[140]
British Columbia	$25,000	01 September 2005[141]
Saskatchewan	$30,000	04 February 2016[142]
Manitoba	$10,000	12 February 2007[143]
Ontario	$25,000	01 January 2010[144]

[140] See AR 139/2014, available online at:
http://www.qp.alberta.ca/documents/orders/orders_in_council/2014/714/2014_271.html.
[141] See s 1 of the *Small Claims Court Monetary Limit Regulation*, BC Reg. 179/2005, *supra* note 6.
[142] See *The Small Claims Amendment Regulations, 2016*, available online at:
http://www.qp.gov.sk.ca/documents/gazette/part2/2016/G2201606.pdf.
[143] See ss 2 to 4 of *The Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Amendment Act*, SM 2006, c 36 (in force 12 February 2007 (Man.Gaz. 27 January 2007), *supra* note 38.
[144] See s 1(1) of the *Small Claims Court Jurisdiction and Appeal Limit*, O Reg 626/00.

Quebec	$15,000	01 January 2015[145]
New Brunswick	$12,500	01 January 2013[146]
Newfoundland and Labrador	$25,000	28 June 2010[147]
Northwest Territories	$35,000	25 August 2011[148]
Nova Scotia	$25,000	01 April 2006[149]
Nunavut	$20,000	31 October 2007[150]
Prince Edward Island	$8,000	01 January 2009[151]
Yukon	$25,000	01 April 2006[152]

[145] See *An Act to amend the Code of Civil Procedure and Other Provisions*, SQ 2014, c 10, available online at: http://www2.publicationsduquebec.gouv.qc.ca/dynamicSearch/telecharge.php?type=5&file=2014C10A.PDF.

[146] See s 3 of NB Reg 2013-103, available online at: http://laws.gnb.ca/en/ShowTdm/cr/2012-103///en.

[147] See *Small Claims Regulations (Amendment)*, NL Reg 37/10, available online at: http://www.assembly.nl.ca/legislation/sr/annualregs/2010/nr100037.htm.

[148] See *An Act to Amend the Territorial Court Act*, SNWT 2011, c 31, available online at: https://www.justice.gov.nt.ca/en/files/bills/16/2011.6/Bill%2022.pdf and s 16(1) of the *Territorial Court Act*, RSNWT 1998, c T-2, available online at https://www.justice.gov.nt.ca/en/files/legislation/territorial-court/territorial-court.a.pdf.

[149] See *An Act to Amend Chapter 430 of the Revised Statutes, 1989, The Small Claims Court Act*, SNS 2005, c 58, available online at: http://nslegislature.ca/legc/bills/59th_1st/3rd_read/b236.htm. Also see M.W. Patry, V. Stinson and S.M. Smith, *Evaluation of the Nova Scotia Small Claims Court: Final Report to the Nova Scotia Law Reform Commission* (March 2009) at 21. This report is available online at: http://www.lawreform.ns.ca/Downloads/SmallClaimsFinaReportFINAL.pdf.

[150] See s 3.1(2) of the *Small Claims Rules of the Nunavut Court of Justice*, Nu Reg 023-2007, available online at: http://gov.nu.ca/sites/default/files/gnjustice2/justicedocuments/Gazette/Part-II/633386654879843750-6837192-2007gaz10part2.pdf.

[151] See *Small Claims Regulations*, EC741/08, available online at: http://www.gov.pe.ca/law/regulations/pdf/J&02-1.pdf and *Index to Part II of the Royal Gazette Containing Regulations of Prince Edward Island* at 4. This *Index* is available online at: http://www.gov.pe.ca/photos/original/gaz_2008part2.pdf.

[152] See *An Act to Amend the Small Claims Court Act*, SY 2005, c 14, amending ss 2(1)(a) and 2(1)(b). The amendment also provides that s 2(1) of the Act is further amended by adding the following paragraph:

> "(d) The Commissioner in Executive Council may by Order increase the monetary jurisdiction of the Small Claims Court under paragraphs 2(1)(a) and 2(1)(b)."

Available online: http://www.gov.yk.ca/legislation/acts/smclco_amend.pdf.

In many Canadian jurisdictions, namely British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Ontario, New Brunswick, Newfoundland and Labrador, and Prince Edward Island, the monetary limit is set out by regulation rather than statute.[153]

Most Canadian jurisdictions do not specify a limit for general damages. In addition to Manitoba, the only other jurisdiction that provides a general damages limit is Nova Scotia, where the limit is set at a mere $100.[154]

B. Small Claims Adjudicators in other Canadian Jurisdictions

Manitoba is the only jurisdiction in Canada to employ court officers who are non-lawyers to adjudicate small claims matters. Some jurisdictions only empower judges to adjudicate small claims,[155] while many others allow for adjudication by non-judges, which, at minimum, are lawyers. In Ontario, small claims are heard by Deputy Judges, who are senior lawyers appointed for a term,[156] but may also be heard by judges of the Superior Court of Justice assigned to Provincial Court (Civil Division) prior to September 1, 1990.[157] In Nova Scotia, small claims are presided over by adjudicators appointed by the Governor in Council on the recommendation of the Attorney General, who must be practising lawyers in good standing.[158] Alberta's *Provincial Court Act* provides that "court" includes justices of the peace[159] and Saskatchewan's *Small Claims Act, 1997*, defines "judge" as a Provincial Court Judge or justice of the peace.[160]

---

[153] See s 1 of the *Small Claims Court Monetary Limit Regulation*, BC Reg 179/2005, available online at: http://www.bclaws.ca/Recon/document/ID/freeside/11_179_2005); Alberta (see section 1.1 of the *Provincial Court Civil Division Regulation*, A.R. 329/1989, available online at: http://www.qp.alberta.ca/documents/Regs/1989_329.pdf); Saskatchewan (see section 3 of the *Small Claims Regulations, 1998*, R.R.S. c. S-50.11 Reg. 1, available online at: http://www.qp.gov.sk.ca/documents/English/Regulations/Regulations/s50-11r1.pdf); Ontario (see section 1(1) of the *Small Claims Court Jurisdiction and Appeal Limit*, O. Reg. 626/00, available online at: https://www.ontario.ca/laws/regulation/000626); New Brunswick (see section 3 of the Regulation under the *Small Claims Act*, NB Reg 2013-103, available online: http://laws.gnb.ca/en/showfulldoc/cr/2012-103/#anchorga:s_1); Newfoundland and Labrador (see NL Reg 37/10); and Prince Edward Island (see s 2 of the Small Claims Regulations, EC741/08, available online: http://www.gov.pe.ca/law/regulations/pdf/J&02-1.pdf.) See also Yukon's *Small Claims Court Act*, SY 2005, c 14, s 2(1)(d), which allows the Commissioner in Executive Council to increase the monetary jurisdiction by Order.

[154] *Small Claims Court Act*, RSNS 1989, c 430, s 11.

[155] See *Small Claims Act*, RSBC 1996, c 430, s 3; *Code of Civil Procedure*, c C-25.01, s 958; and *Small Claims Act*, RSNL 1990, c S-16, ss 2(c) and 3(1).

[156] See Ontario Superior Court of Justice website, "About Judges and Judicial Officials", available online at: http://www.ontariocourts.ca/scj/judges/about/#Deputy_Judges_of_the_Small_Claims_Court.

[157] *Courts of Justice Act*, RSO 1990, c C43, s 24(2) & s 32.

[158] *Small Claims Court Act*, RS 1989, c 430, s 6(1) & (3).

[159] *Provincial Court Act*, RSA 2000, c P-31, s 22.

[160] *Small Claims Act, 1997*, c S-50.11, s 2.

C. Pre-trial Processes in Other Canadian Jurisdictions

In recent years, many provinces and territories have implemented changes to small claims procedure to introduce or enhance pre-trial mediation and settlement processes.[161] The purpose of these pre-trial processes is to try to streamline or consolidate issues, encourage settlement or resolve matters without the need for a trial.

Some Canadian jurisdictions require parties to attend some form of pre-trial conference. For instance, in Ontario, a settlement conference must be held with a judge in every defended action.[162] Likewise in Saskatchewan, a case management conference is required before a trial date is set, unless the judge is of the view that it would not be beneficial.[163] Although voluntary mediation was already available in Quebec, the Government of Quebec recently introduced a pilot project on mandatory mediation for small claims.[164]

D. Some Examples of Small Claims Systems in other Canadian Provinces

Although all jurisdictions share the same goal of providing a simplified process for relatively small claims, the structure and procedure varies across Canadian jurisdictions. This is important to keep in mind when assessing whether certain procedures used in other jurisdictions should be adopted in Manitoba. Below is a description of some of the relevant small claims systems in Canada that help inform this report.

(a) British Columbia

In British Columbia, Small Claims Court is a division of the Provincial Court that hears claims of $25,000 or less. The procedure is set out in the *Small Claims Act*[165] and *Small Claims Rules*.[166] The Provincial Court has jurisdiction over claims for debt or damages, recovery of personal property, specific performance of an agreement relating to personal property or services, or relief

---

[161] See, for example, Legislative Services, Government of Saskatchewan's *Small Claims Court Review Project: Consultation Paper* (the consultation closed on 01 April 2015) at 9 and 10. This paper is available online at: http://www.justice.gov.sk.ca/small-claims-court-review/consultation-paper. See, as well, sections 39 to 43 of the Yukon's *Small Claims Court Regulations*, O.I.C. 1995/152, available online at: http://www.gov.yk.ca/legislation/regs/oic1995_152.pdf, which deal with pre-trial conferences and mediation; and the Northwest Territories' Territorial Court webpages on judicial mediation for small claims matters: https://www.nwtcourts.ca/Courts/small-claims.htm and https://www.nwtcourts.ca/Courts/judicial-mediation.htm.

[162] *Rules of the Small Claims Court*, O Reg 258/98, Rule 13.01(1) & 13.01(5).

[163] *Small Claims Act 1997*, c S-50.11, s 7.1(1). See also the mediation requirement under the *Territorial Court Civil Claims Rules*, R-034-92.

[164] Information regarding Quebec's mandatory mediation pilot project is available online at: http://www.justice.gouv.qc.ca/english/programmes/mediation_creances/accueil-a.htm.

[165] RSBC 1996, c 430.

[166] BC Reg 261/93.

from opposing claims to personal property.[167] It does not have jurisdiction over claims of libel, slander or malicious prosecution.[168]

When a claimant files a claim with the Provincial Court the claimant must serve the defendant with a notice of claim as prescribed by the Rules.[169] The defendant must file a reply within the prescribed time limit.[170] If a defendant fails to reply within the time limit, the claimant may ask for a default order.[171] If a claim is for a debt and the claimant completes the required forms, the registrar must make a default order requiring the defendant to pay immediately the amount claimed plus expenses and any interest claimed.[172]

The procedure for pre-trial settlement depends on the monetary value of the claim and the location where the claim is filed.[173] Subject to certain exceptions, small claims begin with a pre-hearing settlement conference with a judge, where the matter may be settled without the need for a hearing.[174] If the matter is not settled, then a Trial Preparation Settlement Conference may be required. Finally, if settlement is not reached at this second pre-hearing conference, then a date for the hearing is scheduled.

If the claim is between $10,000 and $25,000, any party to the proceeding may initiate mediation.[175] If a matter is not settled pursuant to the mediation session, either a settlement conference with a judge will be scheduled (if a settlement conference has not yet taken place) or the matter will be set down for trial.[176] British Columbia's rules also provide for optional mediation for claims under $10,000, although the availability of mediation is somewhat limited compared to claims between $10,000 and $25,000.[177]

The Legislative Assembly of British Columbia has recently taken steps to create an alternate stream of dispute resolution procedure to deal with small claims outside of the formal court system. In 2012, the Province of British Columbia introduced *Bill 44, The Civil Resolution Tribunal Act*,[178] which was enacted on May 31, 2012. The Act establishes an alternate dispute resolution process that takes disputes out of the formal court system. It is intended to create a

---

[167] *Ibid*, s 3(1).
[168] *Ibid*, s 3(2).
[169] *Small Claims Rules*, *supra* note 166, Rule 2.
[170] *Ibid*, Rule 3(1)-(4).
[171] *Ibid*, Rule 6(1).
[172] *Ibid*, Rule 6(4).
[173] *Ibid*.
[174] *Ibid*, Rule 7(1) & (2).
[175] *Ibid*, Rule 7.3(5).
[176] *Ibid*, Rule 7.3(52).
[177] *Ibid*, Rule 7.2(2). Mediation for claims under $10,000 is only offered for claims that have been filed in the mediation registry, referred to mediation, or a Notice to Mediate form has been filed before July 30, 2015. See also Rules 7.4: In 2007, a pilot project was initiated for small claims of $5,000 or more or for damages for personal injury, and only in Vancouver. However, this project has been phased out, and mediation is not offered where the registrar has not, on or before February 1, 2016, served a notice of mediation session.
[178] Bill 44, *Civil Resolution Tribunal Act*, 4th Sess, 39th Parl, British Columbia, 2012 (assented to 31 May 2012), SBC 2012, c 25.

user-friendly alternative to Small Claims Court, where the process can take place entirely online rather than in person.[179] In 2015, the Legislative Assembly of British Columbia introduced Bill 19, *Civil Resolution Tribunal Amendment Act, 2015*.[180] Under Bill 44, the Civil Resolution Tribunal was voluntary and required the consent of both parties. However, Bill 19 introduces a mandatory component, where claims under a certain amount (expected to be $10,000) and minor strata property disputes must be commenced at the Civil Resolution Tribunal rather than Small Claims Court.[181]

Unlike small claims heard through the current process under the *Small Claims Act*, judges will not hear small claims commenced at the Civil Resolution Tribunal. The legislation is silent as to the qualifications of tribunal members, which are appointed by the provincial government. It appears that all twenty current tribunal members are lawyers.[182]

If a party to a small claim is not satisfied with the Civil Resolution Tribunal, the party may apply to the Provincial Court for judicial review.[183] If successful, the claim will be sent back to the Civil Resolution Tribunal for reconsideration.

The Civil Resolution Tribunal first launched in July 2016 to deal with minor strata disputes,[184] but is expected to begin hearing small claims in early 2017.[185]

(b) Alberta

In Alberta, Small Claims Court is established pursuant to the *Provincial Court Act*.[186] It is a part of the Provincial Court, Civil Division, which hears civil claims up to $50,000. There do not appear to be any restrictions in terms of subject matter jurisdiction.

---

[179] *Ibid.* Section 2(2) provides:

> The mandate of the tribunal is to provide dispute resolution services in relation to matters that are within its authority, in a manner that
>
> (a) is accessible, speedy, economical, informal and flexible,
>
> (b) applies principles of law and fairness, and recognizes any relationships between parties to a dispute that will likely continue after the tribunal proceeding is concluded,
>
> (c) uses electronic communication tools to facilitate resolution of disputes brought to the tribunal, and
>
> (d) accommodates, so far as the tribunal considers reasonably practicable, the diversity of circumstances of the persons using the services of the tribunal.

[180] Bill 19, *Civil Resolution Tribunal Amendment Act*, 4th Sess, 40th Parl, British Columbia, 2015 (assented to 14 May 2015). Available online: https://www.leg.bc.ca/Pages/BCLASS-Legacy.aspx#%2Fcontent%2Fdata%2520-%2520ldp%2Fpages%2F40th4th%2Fvotes%2Fprogress-of-bills.htm.

[181] *Ibid*, Part 1.1.

[182] See the Civil Resolution Tribunal website, "Tribunal Members" page, available online: https://www.civilresolutionbc.ca/about-us/tribunal-members/.

[183] *Bill 19, supra* note 180, s 56.1.

[184] Strata-titled properties can include condos, townhouses, duplexes and sometimes single family homes in strata subdivisions.

[185] See Civil Resolution Tribunal website, "CRT Overview" page, available online: https://www.civilresolutionbc.ca/disputes/.

[186] *Provincial Court Act*, RSA 2000, c P-31, Part 4.

Claims are initiated by applying to a clerk for the issuance of a civil claim.[187] Once served on the defendant, the defendant is required to either pay the amount claimed or file a dispute notice with a clerk within a prescribed period of time.[188] When a dispute notice is filed, the clerk will set the date of a pre-hearing conference, mediation or hearing, as the case may be.[189]

If the court directs the parties to appear before the court for a pre-trial conference, the matter will not be set down for trial or otherwise continued until the conclusion of the pre-trial process.[190] Further, at any time after the notice of dispute is filed, the court may refer the action for mediation or any party can request it.[191]

If the defendant does not pay the claim or file a dispute notice within the prescribed time after being served with a notice of claim, the claimant can obtain default judgment from a clerk of the court upon request and proof of service.[192]

(c) Saskatchewan

Saskatchewan's Small Claims Court is part of the Provincial Court, established by the *Small Claims Court Act, 1997*.[193] The Court hears claims that do not exceed $30,000 and will not hear disputes involving title to land, slander, libel, bankruptcy or false imprisonment.[194]

Claims are initiated when a person applies to a clerk to have a summons issued.[195] The clerk then provides a written statement of claim to a judge.[196] If the judge is satisfied that the plaintiff may have a valid claim, the judge will issue a summons to the defendant and set the date for a case management conference, or, if the judge determines a case management conference would not be beneficial, then the judge will set a trial date.[197] The judge has discretion to give judgment without hearing the evidence if any party does not appear at the trial, where proof of service is filed.[198]

---

[187] *Ibid*, s 25.
[188] *Ibid*, s 26.
[189] *Ibid*, s 27.
[190] *Ibid*, ss 64(1) & 66.
[191] *Ibid*, s 65. See also Alberta's *Mediation Rules of the Provincial Court – Civil Division*, A.R. 271/97, s 2(1). As noted on the Alberta Courts website, mediation and pre-trial conferences are available at some court locations. Available online: https://albertacourts.ca/provincial-court/civil-small-claims-court/civil-claim-process/mediation-and-pre-trial-conferences.
[192] *Ibid*, s 40(1).
[193] SS 1997, c S-50.11.
[194] *Ibid*, 3(9).
[195] *Ibid*, s 6(1).
[196] *Ibid*, s 6(4).
[197] *Ibid*, ss 7(1) & 7.1(3).
[198] *Ibid*, s 26(1).

Costs awards are limited, with costs only awarded for things like filing fees and reasonable expenses, and cannot be awarded for lawyer-related costs.[199]

(d) Ontario

Ontario's Small Claims Court is a branch of the Superior Court of Justice, established by the *Courts of Justice Act*.[200] The Small Claims Court hears claims that do not exceed $25,000.[201] There do not appear to be any restrictions as to subject matter for civil claims that fall within the monetary limit. As previously mentioned, small claims are mainly heard by Deputy Judges, who are senior lawyers appointed for a term,[202] but may also be heard by judges of the Superior Court of Justice assigned to Provincial Court (Civil Division) prior to September 1, 1990.[203]

The procedure for small claims is set out in the *Rules of the Small Claims Court*.[204] As compared to Small Claims Court in other Canadian jurisdictions, the procedure is more formal, with more procedural steps and disclosure requirements. For example, the *Rules of the Small Claims Court* allows parties to make motions, which are not typically seen in small claims procedure and require additional procedural steps such as filing a Notice of Motion and supporting affidavit.[205]

Settlement conferences are mandatory for all defended actions.[206] The parties are required to disclose the evidence upon which they will be relying in advance of the settlement conference. The purposes of settlement conferences include resolving/narrowing issues, encouraging settlement, and providing full disclosure between the parties of the relevant facts and evidence.[207] The statutory mandate of settlement conferences is very broad. For example, judges can make an order adding or deleting a party, consolidating actions, or striking out a claim.[208]

Costs awards for small claims in Ontario can be higher than other Canadian jurisdictions. The successful party is entitled to have reasonable disbursements, including costs of preparing the claim or defence, for example, paid by the unsuccessful party.[209] If a successful party has legal representation, the court may award a reasonable representation fee.[210] Even where the party is

---

[199] *Ibid*, s 31.
[200] RSO 1990, c C43.
[201] *Small Claims Court Jurisdiction*, O Reg 626/00.
[202] See Ontario Superior Court of Justice website, "About Judges and Judicial Officials", available online at: http://www.ontariocourts.ca/scj/judges/about/#Deputy_Judges_of_the_Small_Claims_Court.
[203] *Courts of Justice Act*, *supra* note 201.
[204] O Reg 258/98.
[205] *Ibid*, Rule 15. A motion is a request to a judge to make an order about a case. For example, a defendant could ask the judge for an extension of time to file a defence.
[206] *Ibid*, Rule 13.01(1).
[207] *Ibid*, Rule 13.03(1).
[208] *Ibid*, Rule 13.05(2).
[209] *Ibid*, Rule 19.01(1).
[210] *Ibid*, Rule 19.04.

self-represented, the court may order costs not exceeding $500 for inconvenience and expense.[211] The Rules also give the court the authority to order one party (not necessarily the successful party) to pay the other party if the court is satisfied that the party has unduly complicated or prolonged the action.[212]

While approaches may vary, it appears that every province and territory's approach seeks to strike a balance between the encouragement of early resolution of disputes and keeping the small claims process relatively quick and simple.

[211] *Ibid*, Rule 19.05.
[212] *Ibid*, Rule 19.06.

CHAPTER 4: THE NEED FOR REFORM

Having described the law and procedure regarding small claims in Manitoba and other Canadian jurisdictions, the following section will discuss the need to reform certain aspects of the small claims system to improve the administration of justice.

A. The Consultation Process

On October 24, 2016, the Commission released a Consultation Report on *Improving the Small Claims System in Manitoba*.[213] The purpose of the consultation process was to gather a broad range of perspectives on proposed changes to the *Small Claims Practices Act* and procedure. The Consultation Report was posted on the Commission's website, circulated to the Commission's mailing list, and sent directly to certain individuals and organizations with involvement in the small claims system. In addition, a notice was posted at the Legal Help Centre regarding the project; an email was distributed to the Better Business Bureau's mailing list of Accredited Businesses; and Commission staff conducted in-person meetings with individuals involved in the small claims system. This topic was presented to legal practitioners at a Continuing Professional Development session on Friday, October 21, 2016, for the Civil Litigation Section of the Manitoba Bar Association.

As part of the consultation process, the Commission also created an online, anonymous survey, which was posted on the Commission's website. The Commission received over 60 responses to the survey. Approximately three-quarters of respondents were practising lawyers, while the remaining responses came from individuals who work in the courts system, self-represented litigants, and interested members of the public. A summary of the online survey results can be found at Appendix A.

The Commission received a number of written submissions and informal responses to its proposed recommendations. The Commission's consultation process allowed the Commission to hear from legal practitioners, members of the public, and those working in the court system on issues related to the small claims system in Manitoba. The Commission gave careful consideration to all feedback, which helps to inform this report.

---

[213] Manitoba Law Reform Commission, *Access to Courts and Court Processes: Improving the Small Claims System in Manitoba* (Consultation Report, October 2016), available online: http://manitobalawreform.ca/pubs/pdf/additional/consultation_report_oct2016.pdf.

B. Increasing the Monetary Jurisdiction

As previously stated, the monetary limit for small claims in Manitoba is $10,000. This monetary limit has remained unchanged since 2007. In the Commission's view, reform is appropriate to bring the monetary limit for small claims in line with other Canadian jurisdictions.

The feedback received on this issue was overwhelmingly in favour of increasing the monetary limit. Ninety-five percent of survey respondents indicated that the monetary limit should be increased. When asked what an appropriate monetary limit would be, 27% of respondents indicated that the limit should be between $10,000 and $20,000, 35% indicated that the limit should be $25,000, 22% thought the limit should be $30,000, and 12% thought the limit should be higher than $30,000.

If the monetary limit for small claims were increased, it would enable a greater number of claims to be heard using the simplified process under the *Small Claims Practices Act*. It would recognize the fact that, as the cost of living rises, many claims that exceed $10,000 in value may still involve relatively simple issues, and the more onerous process at the Court of Queen's Bench may be impractical in those cases.

In recommending an increase to the monetary limit for small claims, the Commission is aware of the concern that too high a limit could potentially detract from the purpose of the *Small Claims Practices Act*, which is to determine claims in a simple manner as expeditious, informal and inexpensive as possible.[214] The concern is that too high a monetary limit could run the risk of inviting complex litigation into small claims adjudication where claims are not heard by judges and evidentiary rules are relaxed. At the same time, the Commission understands that the complexity of a claim is not necessarily linked to the monetary value of the claim,[215] and therefore is not persuaded that an increase in the monetary jurisdiction of the *Small Claims Practices Act* will inevitably lead to more complex claims. This view is consistent with the Supreme Court of Canada's recent decision in *Hryniak v. Mauldin*, where the Court held that the justice system requires a shift toward simplified procedures in order to achieve greater access to civil justice.[216] Further, changes to the subject matter jurisdiction of the *Small Claims Practices Act*, discussed below, can help to alleviate some of these concerns.

---

[214] *Small Claims Practices Act, supra* note 11, s 1(3).

[215] See McGill, S., "Small Claims Court Identity Crisis: A Review of Recent Reform Measures," (2010) 49 Can. Bus. LJ 2 at 213, available online at: https://legacy.wlu.ca/documents/42428/2010_CBLJ_final_proofs.pdf. Although statistics are not available regarding the monetary value of claims, it appears that roughly 40% of claims filed at Small Claims Court are regarding collections (i.e. unpaid accounts) in each of the last three years. According to statistics provided by the Court Registry System in an e-mail dated 19 Sep 2016, in 2015, 1684 of the 3793 claims filed at Small Claims Court were for unpaid accounts; in 2014, 1448 of the 3678 claims filed at Small Claims Court were for unpaid accounts; and in 2013, 1437 of the 3720 claims filed at Small Claims Court were for unpaid accounts.

[216] *Hryniak v Mauldin, supra* note 22 at para 2.

There are a number of considerations that should be taken into account in determining the appropriate monetary limit. One approach is to set the limit just below the amount at which a lawyer would be willing to pursue the dispute at the Court of Queen's Bench. With the current limit, it appears that some disputes exceed the monetary jurisdiction of small claims yet the monetary value is too small to be cost-effectively pursued at the Court of Queen's Bench. It puts claimants in the position of having to either abandon the excess and proceed at Small Claims Court or have most of the claim effectively canceled out by expenses and delays. Accordingly, the monetary limit for small claims under the *Small Claims Practices Act* ought to be increased to a value that would capture many of these relatively small claims that cannot be cost-effectively pursued at the Court of Queen's Bench.

Another consideration in determining the appropriate monetary limit is to look at the limits in other Canadian jurisdictions. An increase to the monetary limit between $20,000 and $30,000 would put Manitoba on par with most other Canadian jurisdictions. The most common monetary limit is currently $25,000; five out of thirteen provinces and territories have a limit of $25,000.

Rather than recommend a specific number, the Commission has chosen to simply recommend an increase to the monetary limit. The Commission stresses the importance of increasing the monetary limit as a way to further access to justice objectives and does not want this recommendation to get caught up in a discussion on specific dollar amount. To put this recommendation in context, the Supreme Court of Canada has made it clear that governments need to take action in order to improve access to justice. Increasing the monetary limit under the *Small Claims Practices Act* will help to improve access to justice by not only allowing more people to access the simplified process for small claims, but will also move many smaller civil claims from the Court of Queen's Bench to Small Claims Court, so that the Court of Queen's Bench judges can focus their attention on criminal trials and larger or more complex civil matters.

The Commission received some of the feedback that suggested that an increase to the monetary limit under the *Small Claims Practices Act* should only take place if other changes to the Act were adopted, such as requiring court officers to be lawyers. However, in the Commission's view, acceptance of this recommendation is not dependant on acceptance of any other recommendation contained in this report.

Recommendation #1: The monetary limit under *The Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Act* should be increased.

In making the recommendation to increase the monetary limit for small claims, the next question is whether section 3(1)(a) of the *Small Claims Practices Act* should be amended to reflect this value, or whether the Act should be amended to allow the monetary limit to be adjusted upward

by regulation, which was the approach used in Bill 9, *The Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Amendment Act*,[217] as well as the approach used by most other Canadian jurisdictions.

There are some practical advantages to allowing the monetary limit to be adjusted upward by regulation as opposed to fixing the monetary limit under section 3(1)(a) of the Act. Experience suggests that additional increases to the monetary limit will be needed in future. Accordingly, the Commission recommends that section 3(1) should be amended to allow the monetary limit to be adjusted upward by regulation to allow for maximum flexibility.

Recommendation #2: Section 3(1) of *The Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Act* should be amended to allow the monetary limit for small claims to be adjusted upward by regulation.

C. Increasing the General Damages Limit

As mentioned previously, section 3(1)(a) of the *Small Claims Practices Act* not only creates an overall limit for the amount of money that constitutes a small claim under the Act, but also restricts the amount that may be claimed as general damages. Had Bill 9, *The Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Amendment Act*, been enacted it would have enabled the current $2,000 limit for general damages found in the *Small Claims Practices Act* to be amended upward by regulation.[218] Currently, Manitoba and Nova Scotia are the only Canadian jurisdictions that specifically provide for a general damages limit in their small claims legislation.[219]

The feedback the Commission received on this issue was mostly in favour of increasing the general damages limit. 50% of survey respondents thought the general damages limit should be increased, 32% thought it should remain at $2,000, and 18% responded that there should be no limit on general damages. Some respondents pointed out that the process is not geared, from an evidentiary standpoint, to do a proper assessment of higher general damages.[220]

While the Commission recognizes that a general damages limit for small claims is uncommon in Canada, it nevertheless favours retaining such a limit. In the Commission's view, considering the complexity as well as the precedential value of claims involving significant general damages, a Court of Queen's Bench judge, rather than a court officer at Small Claims Court, should determine these claims. However, if the monetary limit is being increased, it is appropriate to increase the general damages limit proportionately.

---

[217] Bill 9, *supra* note 50.
[218] Bill 9, *The Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Amendment Act*, *supra* note 50, s 3(1.1).
[219] *Small Claims Court Act*, RSNS 1989, c 430, ss 9(a), 10(c) and 11.
[220] One respondent against increasing the general damages limit argued that: "[t]*he administration of justice may be better served by affording self-represented parties an opportunity to defend actions that are measurable, particularly when there may be an imbalance of legal knowledge or experience.*"

Recommendation #3: The general damages limit under *The Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Act* should be increased to an amount proportionate to the increase in the monetary limit for small claims.

Consistent with Recommendation #2, which recommends that section 3(1) of the *Small Claims Act* should be amended to allow the monetary limit to be adjusted upward by regulation as opposed to statute, the Commission recommends that section 3(1) should likewise be amended to allow the general damages limit to be adjusted upward by regulation.

Recommendation #4: Section 3(1) of the *The Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Act* should be amended to allow the general damages limit to be adjusted upward by regulation.

D. Substantive Jurisdiction: Wrongful Dismissal Claims

In other Canadian jurisdictions, concerns have been raised that the increased monetary limit for small claims has led to Small Claims Court capturing wrongful dismissal cases, which are complex matters more suited to formal procedures, stricter rules of evidence, and adjudication by a judge rather than a court officer.[221] In addition to the concern about complexity, in the Commission's view, wrongful dismissal claims may not be appropriate for small claims adjudication because they can lead to new developments in the law and may carry precedential value. However, these concerns can be alleviated with a legislative amendment to the substantive jurisdiction of the court under section 3(4) of the *Small Claims Practices Act*.

Section 3(4) of the *Small Claims Practices Act* provides a list of types of claims which may not be decided under the Act, regardless of whether or not the claimant is only seeking monetary compensation. As discussed previously, most of the restrictions as to subject matter have been put in place because of the complexity of the subject matter involved in the disputes and the interests at stake. The matters listed under section 3(4) do not lend themselves easily to the relaxed rules of evidence, lack of interlocutory proceedings, and informal processes available for small claims matters. Additionally, in order to adjudicate these matters, it would be necessary for the adjudicator in question to have either specialized legal knowledge or formal legal training, which court officers, who are responsible for adjudicating most disputes under the Act, may not have.

---

[221] See for example Inga Andriessen, "Increasing small claims court limit would result in more delays" *Advocate Daily*, available online: http://www.advocatedaily.com/areas-of-law/increasing-small-claims-court-limit-would-result-in-more-delays.html. ("If you're going to increase the limit to $50,000, you're definitely going to be putting more wrongful dismissal cases through small claims, and there's more potential harm to employees who are giving up rights they didn't even know they were giving up.")

The feedback the Commission received on this issue was mixed. On the one hand, some respondents argued that this area of the law is complex and not suited to the small claims forum, while others pointed out that excluding wrongful dismissal claims could mean that some terminated employees would have no practical option for pursuing their claims.

While the Commission understands the concern that removing wrongful dismissal from the subject matter jurisdiction of the *Small Claims Practices Act* could mean that some terminated employees would not have access to the simplified process, it nevertheless favours excluding such claims from small claims adjudication. Although the statistics are not available, the Commission understands that wrongful dismissal claims between $0 and $10,000 are rare. Currently, any wrongful dismissal claim between $10,000 and $100,000 is an expedited action at the Court of Queen's Bench.[222] So if the monetary limit was raised and wrongful dismissal claims were excluded from small claims jurisdictions, those wrongful dismissal claims between $10,000 and the new monetary limit would still be expedited actions. The expedited actions procedure under Rule 20A of *The Queen's Bench Rules* is better suited to deal with these types of claims, where the legal issues can be complex. The concern with leaving wrongful dismissal in the jurisdiction of the *Small Claims Practices Act* is that small claims adjudicators will be considering complex legal issues such as just cause and reasonable notice. Court of Queen's Bench judges are better suited to interpret and apply the law to these more complex legal issues. Further, the procedure under Rule 20A is better suited to wrongful dismissal claims, with more stringent evidentiary requirements, disclosure obligations, and a mandatory case conference.

For these reasons, the Commission recommends amending section 3(4) by adding wrongful dismissal claims to the list of claims which may not be decided under the Act.

Recommendation #5: Wrongful dismissal claims should be added to the list of excluded proceedings under section 3(4) of *The Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Act*.

E. Substantive Jurisdiction: Assessments of Liability Arising from Motor Vehicle Accidents

As previously discussed, section 3(1)(b) of the *Small Claims Practices Act* allows claimants to file claims for the assessment of liability arising from a motor vehicle accident in which the vehicle of the claimant is not damaged. These assessments are purely for the determination of liability. If damage has been sustained to the claimant's vehicle, in addition to the liability assessment under section 3(1)(b), the claimant can also advance a claim for the deductible portion of damages. The Commission notes that, in each of the past three years, approximately

[222] *Court of Queen's Bench Rules*, *supra* note 53, Rule 20A.

10% of small claims filed in Manitoba were for assessments as to liability arising from motor vehicle accidents.[223]

Claims arising from motor vehicle accidents can be heard by Small Claims Court in many other Canadian jurisdictions.[224] However, due to Manitoba's more extensive no-fault insurance system through Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation ("MPIC"), the circumstances under which these types of claims are brought in Manitoba are more limited.

Assessments for liability can take place through two different channels: Small Claims Court or the Liability Review process of MPIC, where an independent adjudicator will provide an opinion on liability. The assessment under the *Small Claims Practices Act* can take place either as the only assessment or as an appeal from MPIC's Liability Review process.[225]

The Commission's Consultation Report raised the issue of whether liability assessments for motor vehicle accidents should be removed from the jurisdiction of the *Small Claims Practices Act*. The Consultation Report asked whether claims under section 3(1)(b) may be better suited to the administrative scheme under *The Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Act*[226] rather than adjudication at Small Claims Court. The majority of feedback on this issue was not in favour of removing liability assessments from the jurisdiction of the *Small Claims Practices Act*. Most respondents thought that claimants should still have the option of going to Small Claims Court, some noting that Small Claims Court is well-suited to deal with these types of assessments.[227]

Based on the feedback the Commission has received on this issue, it has chosen not to make a recommendation. It appears that there are other, more effective ways to improve the efficiency of the administration of justice at Small Claims Court, which will be discussed below.

---

[223] According to statistics provided by the Court of Queen's Bench Registry in an e-mail dated 19 Sep 2016, in 2015, 358 of the 3793 claims filed at Small Claims Court were for motor vehicle accidents; in 2014, 452 of the 3678 claims filed at Small Claims Court were for motor vehicle accidents; and in 2013, 456 of the 3720 claims filed at Small Claims Court were for motor vehicle accidents.

[224] In most cases, while the relevant legislation does not specifically provide that the court has jurisdiction to hear claims related to motor vehicle accidents, these claims are captured under the court's jurisdiction to hear claims for damages up to the monetary limit. Procedural guides in some Canadian jurisdictions discuss claims related to motor vehicle accidents. See for example British Columbia, Ministry of Justice "Making a Claim – Small Claims Procedural Guide", ("If it was an auto accident that led to your claim: You may want to name as defendants both the driver and the registered owner or lessee of the vehicle, if the vehicle was leased.") available online at: http://www.ag.gov.bc.ca/courts/small_claims/info/guides/making_a_claim.htm.

[225] See the description of the Liability Review process on the Manitoba Public Insurance website, available online: https://www.mpi.mb.ca/en/Claims/Vehicle/Collision-Appeals/Pages/liability-review.aspx.

[226] CCSM c P215, s 46.

[227] One respondent to the online survey noted that "*[s]mall claims provides a more formal avenue than the MPI processes the parties have gone through prior to the small claim. My experience is that the courtroom setting helps to discourage the dishonest or fraudulent statements that may have been made previously during MPI's investigatory stage.*"

F. Pre-Trial Process

As previously discussed, small claims procedure in most Canadian jurisdictions provides for some form of pre-trial settlement conference, or alternatively, voluntary or mandatory mediation. Although it appears that the Small Claims Court in Manitoba will provide support to parties interested in mediation and will informally send parties out of the hearing room in order to discuss settlement in some cases, there is no legislated voluntary or mandatory pre-trial process for small claims in Manitoba.[228] The only Canadian jurisdictions that do not provide for a formalized pre-trial settlement or mediation process are Manitoba and Nova Scotia.

In its 1983 *Report on the Structure of the Courts; Part II: The Adjudication of Smaller Claims*, the Commission had recommended that a mediation pilot project be established, in Winnipeg or another centre, "from which the feasibility of a province-wide mediation system [for small claims] be assessed."[229] In its 1998 *Review of the Small Claims Court*, the Commission recommended that "a mediation programme . . . be instituted for the purposes of resolving claims filed in Small Claims Court; mediation should not be mandatory but available if all parties agree."[230] In the Commission's view, those recommendations are still valid today. There is evidence to suggest that small claims litigants who reach settlement through mediation (in jurisdictions where mediation is offered) are more satisfied with the process and outcomes than those whose cases were adjudicated.[231]

The majority of feedback from the Consultation Report was in favour of having some form of pre-trial process. All but 9% of survey respondents indicated that there should be a pre-trial process, although there was no consensus as to whether the process should be mandatory or voluntary. There was also variation as to whether there should be a formalized mediation process or a pre-hearing settlement conference. The feedback from those working in other Canadian jurisdictions was very supportive of establishing some form of pre-trial process in Manitoba, noting that the process in other jurisdictions works well as a triage to streamline the process.[232]

---

[228] See the Manitoba Courts website, *Small Claims Information (Claims Filed after January 1, 2015)*, available online at: http://www.manitobacourts.mb.ca/court-of-queens-bench/court-proceedings/small-claim-information-claims-filed-after-january-1-2015/. ("If you do decide to file a Small Claim, the Court Officers who hear Small Claims may also be able to resolve your claim through mediation, if you and the defendant are open to trying to settle the dispute that way. A mediation can be arranged by either the claimant or defendant contacting the court office and speaking with a Deputy Registrar about this process. If the mediation is not successful, then your claim would proceed to be heard by a different Court Officer.")

[229] See Recommendation 11, 1983 Commission Report, *supra* note 26 at 32.

[230] See Recommendation 7, 1998 Commission Report, *supra* note 33 at 42.

[231] See Wissler, R L, "Mediation and adjudication in the small claims court: The effects of process and case characteristics," *Law & Society Review*, 29 (1995), 323-358, as cited in Law Reform Commission of Nova Scotia, "Evaluation of the Nova Scotia Small Claims Court" (March 2009) at 16, available online: http://www.lawreform.ns.ca/Downloads/SmallClaimsFinaReportFINAL.pdf.

[232] Feedback from an individual with experience in Ontario's process noted that "*the facilitated Settlement Conferences which we are mandated to perform in all Ontario Small Claims are a very useful part of the process.*

The Commission notes that an informal triage system is already taking place at hearings, where the adjudicator will ask the parties if they would like to step outside the hearing room and attempt to reach some sort of settlement. However, there are benefits to establishing a more formal process so that parties are afforded an opportunity to settle their case before going to a hearing, or, at the very least, to know what evidence the other party will be relying on.

While the Commission has chosen not to make a recommendation on this issue, it favours a voluntary approach to pre-trial procedures, recognizing that pre-trial procedures may not be appropriate in every case. A voluntary approach would allow for more flexibility in the system, so that adjudicators and parties would have the ability to refer a claim outside the adjudication process, the purpose of which would be to try to streamline or consolidate issues, encourage settlement or resolve the matter without the need for a hearing. The goals of a pre-trial process, if established, should be to resolve claims in a simple manner as expeditious, informal and inexpensive as possible without imposing unnecessary burden on the small claims system.

G. Costs

(a) Whether to Increase the Costs Award

Costs awards are generally designed to compensate the successful party to an action for legal fees incurred in pursuing or defending against a claim. In the case of small claims, maximum costs awards are typically very low. The rationale for this is that, while Canadian jurisdictions (with the exception of Quebec) do not exclude representation by lawyers, limited costs awards work as a disincentive for lawyers to represent claimants with respect to small claims.

Section 14(1)(a) of the *Small Claims Practices Act* allows a judge or court officer to make a costs award to a successful party. However, the costs award cannot exceed $100, except in exceptional circumstances.[233] By contrast, section 14(2) provides that, on appeal, the court may order the successful party such costs as the court may allow. In its 1983 *Report on the Structure of the Courts; Part II: The Adjudication of Smaller Claims*, the Commission had recommended that "no counsel fees [costs] be generally awarded unless the Court is satisfied that the special circumstances of a case make it necessary in the interests of justice to do so."[234] The Commission noted that costs awards in small claims matters were severely restricted in other Canadian jurisdictions, and, more importantly, that "this Court is designed for self-

---

[...] *Settlement Conferences serve to assist in streamlining cases, and affording an opportunity to someone legally trained to advise a plaintiff or defendant, as the case might be, either that their claim lacks merit or that a particular defence effectively lacks any legal substance whatsoever.*"

[233] The court may also award the successful party "disbursements that are reasonably incurred for the purposes of the claim." See section 14(1)(b) of the *Small Claims Practices Act, supra* note 11.

[234] See Recommendation 2, 1983 Commission Report, *supra* note 26 at 42-43.

representation. Therefore, if parties wish legal representation, they should do so at their own expense."[235]

The majority of respondents indicated that the costs awards should be increased. 83% of respondents thought that the limit under section 14(1) of the Act should be increased, 12% responded that the limit should remain the same, and 4% thought that costs awards should not be available. Several respondents indicated that court officers should be vested with greater discretion to order higher costs awards where the circumstances warrant it.

An increase to the monetary limit for small claims could mean that more claimants will choose to have legal representation as the claims get higher. If the monetary limit were increased, it may be appropriate for an adjudicator to award a higher cost award depending on the circumstances of the case. In the Commission's view, although the cost award should remain quite limited, it is important to allow some discretion in exceptional circumstances. The Commission has determined that it would be appropriate to limit costs to $500 except in exceptional circumstances.

Recommendation #6: The costs limit under section 14(1)(a) of *The Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Act* should be increased to $500, except in exceptional circumstances.

(b) "Successful Party"

During the consultation process, the Commission received feedback on another issue related to section 14(1) of the *Small Claims Practices Act*. The feedback relates to the qualifier that any costs are awarded to the successful party. Section 14(1) begins: "A judge or court officer hearing a claim may award the successful party an amount..." The Commission heard this stipulation that costs only be awarded to successful parties can be limiting in some cases. Circumstances will arise where there is no successful party yet it would be appropriate to award costs to one of the parties or where the conduct of the successful party is such that it would be just to award the unsuccessful party a costs award.

In canvassing other Canadian jurisdictions, the Commission notes that not every jurisdiction uses the word "successful." Further, in Ontario, where only the successful party is entitled to have costs paid by the unsuccessful party,[236] the Rules also give the court the authority to order one party (not necessarily the successful party) to pay the other party if the court is satisfied that the party has unduly complicated or prolonged the action.[237]

---

[235] *Ibid* at 42.
[236] Ontario's Small Claims Rules, *supra* note 204, Rule 19.01(1).
[237] *Ibid*, Rule 19.06.

Accordingly, the Commission is of the view that removing the word "successful" from section 14(1) will allow for more flexibility for adjudicators to make costs awards that are fair depending on the circumstances.

Recommendation # 7: The word "successful" should be removed from Section 14(1) of *The Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Act.*

H. Adjudication of Small Claims

As stated previously, very few small claims matters in Manitoba are heard by judges. Recent amendments to the *Small Claims Practices Act* appear to have been expressly enacted to ensure that this continues to be the case. The Act specifies that a claim must be heard by a court officer unless a court officer, in the interests of the administration of justice, directs otherwise, or the Government of Manitoba is a party to the claim.[238]

Court officers in Manitoba are not required to be practising lawyers or have law degrees. Manitoba is the only jurisdiction in Canada to employ court officers who are non-lawyers to adjudicate small claims matters.[239] In its 1983 and 1998 reports on small claims procedure in Manitoba, the Commission recommended that small claims adjudicators have formal legal training.[240] To date, this recommendation has not been implemented. In its 1983 report, the Commission noted "legal training is essential because of the importance of the concept of equality before the law and the fact that the court system must not be seen to be administering a different form of justice for claims of lower sums."[241]

This issue received a great deal of feedback in the Commission's consultation process. Overwhelmingly, respondents were in favour of requiring court officers to be lawyers, or, at the very least, to have some degree of legal training. 55% of survey respondents thought that court officers should be practising lawyers and 43% thought they should have some form of legal training.[242]

The Commission has considered the arguments for and against requiring court officers to be lawyers. On the one hand, requiring all court officers to be lawyers would put Manitoba on par with other Canadian jurisdictions. It would mean that individuals with specialized legal training would be applying legal principles in a forum where appeals are only available for errors of law.

---

[238] *The Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Regulation*, Man Reg 283/2015, s 1.
[239] See McGill, S, *supra* note 24.
[240] See Recommendation 2, 1983 Commission Report, *supra* note 26 at 17 and 18, and Recommendation 1, 1998 Commission Report, *supra* note 33 at 28 -31. In the 1998 Commission Report, the Commission was quite specific in its recommendation, stating that "[s]mall claims hearing officers should be appointed from the ranks of practicing lawyers with at least five years experience in practice."
[241] 1983 Commission Report, *supra* note 26 at 17.
[242] Note that the online survey did not specify what form of legal training would be required.

On the other hand, the Commission acknowledges that non-lawyers are capable of applying laws and making decisions that affect people's rights in other forums, such as administrative tribunals.[243] Further, the Commission is not convinced that increasing the monetary limit under the *Small Claims Practices Act* will result in a greater proportion of complex legal issues.

For all these reasons and consistent with its past reports, the Commission has concluded that requiring court officers to be lawyers is the favoured approach. However, the Commission has chosen not to make a recommendation on this point. Although the Commission notes that it would be ideal to have lawyers adjudicate small claims, at the very least there should be some form of mandatory ongoing legal training for non-lawyers. The Commission would also like to stress that this issue is separate and apart from the question of increasing the monetary limit under the *Small Claims Practices Act*. In the Commission's view, the monetary limit should be increased regardless of whether adjudicators are lawyers.

I. Default Judgment

The Commission received feedback suggesting that the procedure for default judgment under the *Small Claims Practices Act* and Rules was in need of reform. The Commission has considered the feedback and has determined that changes to the Notice of Appearance and default judgment process are required in order to improve the efficiency of the small claims system in Manitoba.

Recall that, under the current procedure, once a claimant files his or her claim, the claimant has 30 days to serve the defendant(s) with a copy of the claim.[244] The claimant must also serve the defendant with a Notice of Appearance.[245] The defendant is not required to file a Notice of Appearance with the court registry, but doing so signals the defendant's intention to appear in court to dispute the claim or request time to pay the amount claimed.

The *Queen's Bench Rules* provide:

> Defendant's Notice of Appearance — Form 76D

---

[243] For example, the Residential Tenancies Commission, established by *The Residential Tenancies Act*, CCSM c R119, s 145, is an administrative tribunal that hears appeals from decisions and order of the director under the Act. The Act does not require the Commissioners to be lawyers. Commissioners are appointed by the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council. Pursuant to s 145(2):

> The commission shall consist of the following classes of persons who shall be appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council:
>
> 1. Persons who in the opinion of the Lieutenant Governor in Council are representative of the knowledge and views of landlords.
> 2. Persons who in the opinion of the Lieutenant Governor in Council are representative of the knowledge and views of tenants.
> 3. Persons who in the opinion of the Lieutenant Governor in Council are neutral and not representative of the views of either landlords or of tenants.

[244] *Small Claims Practices Act*, *supra* note 11, s 6(2.1) & 6(3).

[245] *The Court of Queen's Bench Rules*, *supra* note 53, Rules 76.03-76.06.

> 76.05(1) A defendant who intends to dispute a claim is entitled to file a Notice of Appearance (Form 76D) setting out his or her intention to appear at the hearing. The notice is to be filed in the court office specified on the notice not later than seven days before the hearing date.
>
> Defendant entitled to be heard
>
> 76.05(2) Despite subrule (1), a defendant who appears at the hearing of a claim but has not filed a Notice of Appearance is entitled to be heard.

Several respondents identified the optional nature of the Notice of Appearance as problematic; notwithstanding a defendant's failure to file a Notice of Appearance, if the defendant shows up at the hearing, he or she is entitled to be heard.[246] This can create a situation where the claimant and the court do not know until the hearing date whether the defendant will appear and, if so, whether the claim is contested or not. For claimants, this sometimes means that they will travel, book off work, bring witnesses, etc., not knowing whether their matter will actually be heard.

Under the current law, if a defendant does not appear at the hearing of a claim, the judge or court officer must allow the claimant to prove service of the claim, hear and decide the claim in the absence of the defendant, and dismiss any counterclaim made by the defendant.[247] This may result in a default judgment being made against the defendant. This procedure can be contrasted with the rules regarding default judgment at the Court of Queen's Bench, where a defendant who fails to file a statement of defence within the prescribed time may be noted in default. According to the *Queen's Bench Rules*, in these circumstances the plaintiff may, on filing proof of service of the statement of claim, require the registrar to note the defendant in default.[248] In other words, the claimant can get default judgment without having to appear before a court officer or judge for a hearing.

Many respondents to the online survey identified default judgment as the most problematic aspect of procedure for small claims. Some suggested there should be a process that allows a claimant to obtain default judgment without the need to appear and "prove" their claim. One respondent to the online survey said that without an efficient default judgment procedure, the respondent files claims at the Court of Queen's Bench for amounts under $10,000 in order to have access to the more efficient Court of Queen's Bench default judgment process.

As previously mentioned, other Canadian jurisdictions, such as British Columbia, Alberta and Ontario, have procedures to process default judgment administratively, rather than requiring claimants to appear at a hearing and prove their claim. In the Commission's view, if such a procedure were adopted in Manitoba, it would improve the administration of justice and free up resources at Small Claims Court.

---

[246] *Queen's Bench Rules*, *supra* note 53, Rule 76.05(2).
[247] *Small Claims Practices Act*, *supra* note 11, s 9(2).
[248] *Queen's Bench Rules*, *supra* note 53, Rule 19.01(1).

Considering that the purpose of the *Small Claims Practices Act* is to provide for the determination of claims in an expeditious, informal and inexpensive manner, it does not make sense that the procedure for default judgment is more onerous compared to the Court of Queen's Bench procedure for default judgment. Accordingly, the Commission recommends that the procedure for default judgment under the *Small Claims Practices Act* and Rule 76 of the *Queen's Bench Rules* should be amended so that the process mirrors that of the Court of Queen's Bench.

In order to carry out this recommendation, certain changes to the *Small Claims Practices Act* and *Queen's Bench Rules* will need to be made:

- Rule 76.05(1) should be amended to require a defendant who intends to dispute a claim to file a Notice of Appearance within a prescribed period of time.
- Rule 76.05(2), which provides that, despite subrule (1), a defendant who appears at the hearing of a claim but has not filed a Notice of Appearance is entitled to be heard, should be repealed.
- The requirement of a court officer to set a date for the hearing of a claim upon the filing of the claim under section 8(1) of the Act should be eliminated. Rather, a hearing date should only be set when the defendant files a Notice of Appearance.
- The Act should be amended to provide that, where a defendant fails to file a Notice of Appearance within the prescribed time, the claimant may require the registrar to note the defendant in default.

These recommendations, if implemented, would put Manitoba's small claims system on par with other Canadian jurisdictions. These changes would also free up resources at Small Claims Court to deal with disputed claims so that the system could better accommodate an increase to the monetary limit.

Recommendation #8: Rule 76.05(1) of *The Court of Queen's Bench Rules* should be amended to require a defendant who intends to dispute a claim to file a Notice of Appearance within a prescribed period of time.

Recommendation #9: Rule 76.05(2) of *The Court of Queen's Bench Rules* should be repealed.

Recommendation #10: The requirement of a court officer to set a date for the hearing of a claim upon the filing of the claim under section 8(1) of *The Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Act* should be eliminated, and a hearing date should only be set when the defendant files a Notice of Appearance.

Recommendation #11: *The Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Act* should be amended to provide that where a defendant fails to file a Notice of Appearance within the prescribed time, the claimant may require the registrar to note the defendant in default.

J. Other Issues

In addition to the valuable feedback received on the issues discussed above, the Commission received feedback on some other issues related to the *Small Claims Practices Act* and procedure, including:

- Improvement to enforcement of judgment procedures;
- Introducing a basic discovery requirement to small claims procedures;
- Making more information available for self-represented litigants regarding the small claims process;
- Allowing for videoconferencing to remote and northern locations in Manitoba;
- Providing for a minimum bond for judgment recovery;
- Providing for the consolidation of actions to prevent parties from splitting actions into multiple actions for lesser amounts; and
- Changes to the Tariff A Costs under the *Queen's Bench Rules*.

While some of these issues may warrant additional study, the Commission has chosen not to address them in this report and makes no comment as to the merits of the suggested changes.

CHAPTER 5 – SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation #1: The monetary limit under *The Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Act* should be increased. (page 32)

Recommendation #2: Section 3(1) of *The Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Act* should be amended to allow the monetary limit for small claims to be adjusted upward by regulation. (page 33)

Recommendation #3: The general damages limit under *The Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Act* should be increased to an amount proportionate to the increase in the monetary limit for small claims. (page 33)

Recommendation #4: Section 3(1) of the *The Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Act* should be amended to allow the general damages limit to be adjusted upward by regulation. (page 34)

Recommendation #5: Wrongful dismissal claims should be added to the list of excluded proceedings under section 3(4) of the *The Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Act*. (page 35)

Recommendation #6: The costs limit under section 14(1)(a) of *The Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Act* should be increased to $500, except in exceptional circumstances. (page 39)

Recommendation #7: The word "successful" should be removed from Section 14(1) of *The Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Act.* (page 40)

Recommendation #8: Rule 76.05(1) of *The Court of Queen's Bench Rules* should be amended to require a defendant who intends to dispute a claim to file a Notice of Appearance within a prescribed period of time. (page 43)

Recommendation #9: Rule 76.05(2) of *The Court of Queen's Bench Rules* should be repealed. (page 43)

Recommendation #10: The requirement of a court officer to set a date for the hearing of a claim upon the filing of the claim under section 8(1) of *The Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Act* should be eliminated, and a hearing date should only be set when the defendant files a Notice of Appearance. (page 43)

Recommendation #11: *The Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Act* should be amended to provide that where a defendant fails to file a Notice of Appearance within the prescribed time, the claimant may require the registrar to note the defendant in default. (page 43)

This is a report pursuant to section 15 of the *Law Reform Commission Act*, C.C.S.M. c. L95, signed this 31st day of January, 2017.

"Original Signed by"
Cameron Harvey, President

"Original Signed by"
Hon. Lori Spivak, Commissioner

"Original Signed by"
Jacqueline Collins, Commissioner

"Original Signed by"
Michelle Gallant, Commissioner

"Original Signed by"
Myrna Phillips, Commissioner

"Original Signed by"
Sacha Paul, Commissioner

APPENDIX A

Results of the Commission's Online Survey Regarding Small Claims

This anonymous online survey was posted on the Commission's website from October 24, 2016 to December 15, 2016.

(61 Respondents in Total)

1. Who Responded?

I have represented myself at Small Claims Court	11.76%
I am an interested member of the public	9.80%
I work in the courts system	7.84%
I am a practising lawyer	76.47%

2. Should the monetary limit be increased?

Yes	90.48%
No	9.52%

3. What should the monetary limit for small claims be?

$10,000	5.00%
In the range of $10,000 to $20,000	26.67%
$25,000	35.00%
$30,000	21.67%
Higher than $30,000	11.67%

4. Should the general damages limit be increased?

Yes	50.00%
No, it should stay the same	31.67%
There shouldn't be a limit on general damages	18.33%

5. Should wrongful dismissal be added to the list of excluded proceedings under *The Small Claims Practices Act*?

Yes	50.88%
No	49.12%

6. Should assessments of liability arising from motor vehicle accidents in which the vehicle of the claimant is not damaged be removed from the jurisdiction of Small Claims Court?

Yes	39.29%

No	60.71%

7. Should small claims adjudicators be required to have some legal training?

Yes, court officers should be practising lawyers	55.00%
Yes, court officers should have some form of legal training, although not necessarily practising lawyers	43.33%
No, they should not be required to have some legal training	1.67%

8. Should there be a pre-trial process provided for in the rules relating to small claims in Manitoba? Check all that apply:

Mandatory pre-hearing settlement conference	40.35%
Mandatory pre-hearing mediation process	26.32%
Voluntary pre-hearing settlement conference	38.60%
Voluntary pre-hearing mediation process	33.33%
No, this should not be provided in the Act or rules	8.77%

9. Which statement best reflects your opinion on the costs award limit under The Small Claims Practices Act?

The rules relating to costs should remain the same	11.67%
No costs awards should be provided, except in exceptional circumstances	3.33%
The $100 limit should be increased	83.33%
Other	1.67%

10. Please let us know if you think there are other issues the Commission should consider.

The commission should consider ways to make northern hearing more accessible in terms of video conferencing from a location in Winnipeg. Additionally more needs to be done to accomadate high volume users of the court like Manitoba Hydro with additional collection dockets, the ability to adjourn some matters sine die pending settlement, additional orders extending time and simpler guidelines & requirements for the application of and issuance of orders for substitutional service. Centralize a Small Claims Court Counter in a single location like St. Boniface and away from 408 York Ave. and have all hearings at the single secure court location rather than 373 Broadway & 614 Des Meurons.

A default judgment process that allows a claimant to obtain it against a non-responsive defendant without the need to appear and "prove" their claim. Because this is not an option, many plaintiffs file Queen's Bench actions for amounts under $10,000 to have access to the QB default process.

some basic discovery should be required. claimants should have to file with their claim every document that they will be relying on and a list of witnesses. it wouldn't have to be served, but defendants should be able to get some information before showing up in court.

The most important of the potential changes is the addition of mediation resources. As I said, the court office should have at least one full-time, trained mediator on staff, available where both parties request mediation.

I volunteer at the Legal Help Centre and we receive frequent inquiries for information on relatively simple matters. Small claims should provide a guide with basic elements of pleadings, sample pleadings for common claims, basic information on hearing procedure and decorum and tips such as arriving 15 minutes, where/when to stand/sit. There should be assistance provided on service of documents and a simple process for substitutional service with updated/less costly options. Of particular importance would be practical guidance on the enforcement of judgments. People express great dissatisfaction on having gone through the long process to obtain judgement - they cannot collect. Having this information available early may change whether someone pursues a small claim in the first place. In fact, Manitoba's enforcement legislation (Executions Act, Judgments Act, Garnishment Act, QB Rules etc) needs to be modernized.

There should be an automatic right to appeal (hearing de novo) for any judgment exceeding $10,000. That is, leave should not be required.

As stated above, Small Claims Hearing Officers should be lawyers. They are making decisions for people in Manitoba and some may not be in line with the actual rules and case law. Now that there isn't the automatic right of appeal to QB, it strikes me that it is even more important that the hearing officers get things right. If the decision is to raise the limit I would suggest that the argument for this goes up exponentially.

Parties should have to post a minimum bond to ensure there is a minimal judgment recovery. Having hearing officers with legal training is a necessity to avoid injustice. Allow appeal as of right upon posting of security equal to 50% of claim amount.

As a lawyer I have appeared numerous times in the MB small claims Court. In my current position I instruct defence counsel in matters in all provinces of Canada, including at small claims court. The larger limits are a big problem, because sometimes the process doesn't allow for proper documentary or discovery, so it is difficult to understand your risk and difficult to defend at trial. If the limits are increased, then so should the disclosure process. The problem with that is eventually the rules are complicated enough that it is so expensive that it might as well not be a small claims action at all. I think Manitoba has a good balance as it stands now and should not be changed. $10,000.00, for many people involved at small claims, is the difference between bankruptcy or not. At $20,000.00, people will absolutely want to pay a lawyer

to protect them, and the process necessarily gets more expensive and complicated and long. Our expedited QB rules work well for claims above the small claims limit.

In my view there should be a "motion to strike" or summary dismissal process of small claims. The fact that there is no process to have a claim dismissed other than running a trial and calling evidence means a significant amount of time and effort must be expended even when there is clearly no cause of action. At the first appearance there should be a mechanism to look at the cause of action being alleged and make a determination as to whether that is a cause of action recognized at law.

The Commission should seriously consider amending the rules as they relate to pre-hearing disclosure. At present, there is no requirement to exchange documents or names of witnesses. With respect, I believe it would be grossly unfair to increase the damages limit while not providing some level of procedural fairness. The defendant should know ahead of time the case he or she needs to meet so that appropriate evidence and witnesses can be called. I also think, if the limit is to be increased, there should be provision for (i) requiring statements of defence, (ii) motions to dismiss for frivolous actions or where no cause of action is disclosed, and (iii) the ability to note default judgment.

A practice directive setting out the procedure of small claims would be very helpful. It is usually uncertain when attending at court whether the matter is actually going to be heard, even when it is scheduled. When lawyers and witnesses are required to attend multiple times, the cost efficiency of small claims is sacrificed.

I think it would be helpful for self-represented claimants to have access to some assistance in collecting on their Judgments

It's an important and necessary forum, particularly in an age where access to justice is of grave concern. It needs to be bolstered. Raise the limit, and run it a little more effectively. It's important that people can have small disputes dealt with in an efficient way.

Feedback I have heard from clients is that the triage system is frustrating. It discourages them from attempting to settle because they do not want to lose their spot that day and have to return requiring them to miss another day of work.

I just really want more defined processes and legally trained hearing officers

It is not appropriate or just to have people who are not legally trained determining legal issues. The $10,000.00 claim limit is not reasonable. Many proceedings are pushed to Queen's Bench 20A actions because of this limit, even though the damages are too small to be worthwhile of a

trial. The low limit forces claimants to either waive their excess or spend more on legal fees for a 20A action that would be better suited as a small claim.

Having spent a lot of time in small claims court, there is often a lot of confusion amongst claimants/defendants. Due to time/resource constraints, many claims are not heard on their first court appearance, but the claimants and defendants are not aware that this is a possibility. I think this should be communicated somehow in the court materials. Maybe some type of legal glossary could be included with court materials provided when a claim is filed. Not all claimants have access to the internet or are tech-savvy. Additionally, language is a barrier, and we should obtain translations of these materials in some of the commonly spoken languages in Manitoba - German, Tagalog, Mandarin, Cantonese, Punjab, Hindi, Arabic, Spanish etc. Personally, I thought about conducting some small claims court information sessions at various Immigrant Services centres to help provide guidance on the Manitoban court system.

The Masters should be utilized more to hear the larger claims.